THE MANAGERIAL ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION IN THE CONTEXT OF DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS IN KWAZULU-NATAL

by

SIPHO PATRICK MAZIBUKO

submitted in accordance with the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in the subject

EDUCATION MANAGEMENT

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

PROMOTER : PROFESSOR J. N. VAN WYK

FEBRUARY 2007

SUMMARY

A number of educational reform initiatives are being introduced in South Africa to address the imbalances of the past. Schools with different backgrounds are expected to implement these reform initiatives. Due to their diverse contexts, schools approach, interpret and implement these initiatives differently. Consequently, these schools demonstrate different attitudes towards these initiatives. Whole-school evaluation is one of these reform initiatives. As a result of the changes taking place in the education system in South Africa, roles performed by all stakeholders in the education system have also been affected. Since the principal is fully responsible for the proper functioning of the school, this study explored his/her managerial role in whole-school evaluation, particularly within the context of disadvantaged schools/communities. It examines how educational changes impact on the roles of the principal, particularly the principal of a disadvantaged school. The study includes a literature review from local and international perspectives of whole-school evaluation, the managerial role of the principal and disadvantaged schools/communities. A qualitative investigation of the managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation in the context of disadvantaged schools in KwaZulu-Natal was conducted. Data were analysed, discussed and synthesised. The study revealed that whole-school evaluation is not fully being implemented. Shortage of supervisors in the province, lack of educator training, particularly of principals in whole-school evaluation and lack of support from the Department of Education, particularly District Offices, are regarded as the major factors that impede the proper implementation of whole-school evaluation. As a result principals are not certain about the roles they should play in whole-school evaluation. The study shows that findings and recommendations of the supervisors have not been addressed. This is attributed to the poor communication between the District Office and schools to address areas identified by schools in their improvement plans. What compounds the problem is that the role of the Circuit Office in whole-school evaluation is unclear. This has a bearing on the functioning of schools because the Circuit Office is closer to the schools and should, therefore, communicate with them regularly. Based on findings, recommendations for improving the role of the principal were proposed.

KEY TERMS

Developmental Appraisal system

Disadvantaged

Evaluation

Integrated Quality Management System

KwaMashu

KwaZulu-Natal

Managerial role

Principal

Qualitative research

School

Whole-school evaluation

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

***I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to the following*:**

- Professor J. N. van Wyk, my promoter, for her invaluable support, guidance and encouragement throughout all aspects of this study.
- Professor E. M. Lemmer for her assistance with the final editing of the manuscript.
- The principals, educators and the Department of Education officials for sharing with me their experiences, perceptions and expectations regarding the managerial role of the principal, the implementation of whole-school evaluation and other changes in the education system.
- All my friends and colleagues for supporting me in different ways during this study.
- My mother, Thokozile, my sisters, Gugu and Thandi, and my niece, Philile, for their encouragement and moral support all the time.
- My dear children, Sithembile, Nqobile, Siyanda and Khwezi for their understanding, patience and love.
- My dear and best friend, Nonhlanhla, for her support, motivation and love.

DEDICATION

***This work is dedicated to the following*:**

My children:

Sithembile, Nqobile, Siyanda and Khwezi.

The deceased:

My father, Gideon “S'kebhe Mketule”, my grandmother, Esther Nonsonyama, my aunt Ntombikayise and uncles Mandlenkosi, Johannes and Abednigo “Bhansela”.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND, PROBLEM FORMULATION AND AIMS

CHAPTER 2

EVALUATION IN EDUCATION AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION

CHAPTER 3

THE MANAGERIAL ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL AND SCHOOLING IN DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS/COMMUNITIES

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

CHAPTER 5

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF KEY THEMES

CHAPTER 6

OVERVIEW OF INVESTIGATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND, PROBLEM FORMULATION AND AIMS

1.1 INTRODUCTION : WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION

For many years, South Africa had no national system of evaluating the performance of schools and there was no comprehensive data on the quality of teaching, or on the educational standards achieved in the system. As a result, the National Policy for Whole-School Evaluation has been introduced in order to address these shortcomings (RSA, 2001:7). The goal of evaluation is always school improvement and/or the provision of quality education. Such evaluation can be aimed at the individual, for example, developmental appraisal system (DAS) that looks at the individual staff member or at the whole school, for example, whole-school evaluation (WSE) that looks at the school in its totality. For any evaluation to be successfully done, there should be set standards. Thus, the National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation has been developed and is designed to ensure that school evaluation is carried out according to an agreed national model (Steyn, 2002a:262). This policy is aimed at improving the overall quality of education in South African schools (RSA, 2001:7). This can be achieved through an effective system of quality assurance.

Lemmer (1998a:117) maintains that quality is the key feature of current educational debates. Quality schooling, quality assurance, quality management and quality audits are themes that reoccur in policy documents dealing with the reform of education at all levels across the international arena. However, Horine, Hailey and Rubach (1993:33) warn that quality education does not flow naturally from the improvement of existing internal processes such as transportation, registration, curriculum and teaching methods. Quality education also requires the improvement or redesign of external processes linked to other educational institutions, state agencies, community social systems and family units. Therefore, the school should strive to form partnerships with these institutions as well as the other community entities. The National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation is designed to achieve the goal of school improvement through a partnership between supervisors, schools and support services at one level and National and Provincial governments at another (RSA, 2001:8).

With the democratisation of education and the associated decentralisation of authority, schools are increasingly being held accountable for their performance. This implies that school improvement is

the responsibility of the school as much as it is of the National and Provincial departments of education (Department of Education, 2000a:7). Lemmer (1998a:117) agrees and maintains that governments in many parts of the world, including South Africa, are pressing educational institutions to pay more attention to quality and to be more accountable to the public for quality. This is done by a fully integrated approach to quality assurance and quality management for school systems. According to Lemmer (1998a:117), this new approach seeks to bring together the focus of accountability of public schools and the strategic development of quality in schools. Thus, to ensure that this happens, educational changes are being witnessed not only in South Africa, but also in many parts of the world. According to the Department of Education (2000a:7), in order to meet the demands for improved quality and standards, schools need to establish appropriate strategies for the monitoring and evaluation of the work. This can only happen in a school where all role-players understand not only the policy, but also their respective roles in the implementation of that policy. Thus, the school principal should play an important role in ensuring that all role-players in the school understand the departmental policies and their new roles in order to be able to implement such policies correctly. As Claassen (1999:8) puts it, in schools, the role of the principal is central to an understanding of the processes of policy implementation. But principals increasingly encounter a fast changing and confusing policy environment in which they have to somehow work strategically with particular policy prescriptions. This is a big challenge to the principal, because everyone at school will always look to him/her for guidance, direction and assistance. The school principal will not be able to offer these if he/she is not conversant with these new changes. Thus, the Department of Education should ensure that school principals first and foremost understand policy changes before such policies are implemented.

Claassen (1999:14) is of the opinion that for a policy to have a chance of success, a sufficient number of people must be persuaded that it is right, necessary and implementable. At a school level, the school principal should perform this role. Bradshaw and Buckner (1994:78) maintain that research has shown that principals are key agents in bringing about significant change in schools. Hoberg (1993:65) agrees and adds that what is achieved in the school in terms of the quality of education, invariably depends on the crucial leadership role of the principal and his/her ability to foster organisational commitment among the staff, learners and parents. But the principal can only play this cardinal role if he/she is conversant with departmental policies and/or changes. Thus, in-service training and relevant workshops should always form an integral part of preparing the educational fraternity for whatever changes are being introduced.

As is the case with other educational policies, the principal ought to understand whole-school evaluation and its implications with regard to quality education. According to the Department of Education (2000b:1), whole-school evaluation is one intervention to move schools that are in a critical situation along the path to becoming effective schools. Likewise, Steyn (2002a:262) regards whole-school evaluation as a process that is meant to be supportive and developmental rather than punitive and judgmental. Thus, good and underachieving schools should be identified and underachieving schools should then be supported. Schools can only be supported if their strengths and weaknesses are known. Malcolm (2001:225) identifies the following types of schools:

- Schools that are 'self-managing' and already operating in the style of 'learning organisations'. In these schools workshops with individual educators can suffice. These schools have internal processes and structures to capitalise on the workshops;
- Schools that are functional but unsure about change. Here more intervention is required at the whole-school level, perhaps through whole-school workshops and additional support for planning and experimentation in learning areas or phases;
- Schools that are dysfunctional. In these schools intervention at the whole-school level is arguably a precondition for working with individual educators.

This suggests that school evaluation should be done within the particular context of its environment. As the Department of Education (2000b:1) points out, there are many whole-school evaluation models that differ in approach and scope. These models all have their own unique strengths and limitations. The Department of Education (2000b:1) argues that these whole-school evaluation models remain essential instruments for informed decision making in most areas of policy intervention. However, Kilfeather (2000:2), using Ireland as an example, points out that in reality the pilot phase of whole-school evaluation cannot accurately be described as whole-school evaluation unless it engages the whole-school community. The absence of input from the key stakeholders such as the learners and another essential stakeholder group such as parents represents a fundamental flaw in the process. Kilfeather (2000:2) warns that any evaluation process that focuses only on the providers of the service and does not give the users of the service an opportunity to be heard cannot be termed evaluation. It is a partial review. Meanwhile, Griffiths (1998:2) maintains that "whole school" evaluation, as one of the techniques used to evaluate school performance in both England and New Zealand is both intrusive and expensive. The programmes operated by the Office for Standards in Education in England (OFSTED) and the Review Office in

New Zealand are good examples. These programmes are very thorough, but they are expensive to operate and they also generate some anger and resentment among educators. Resentment among educators has also been witnessed in South Africa as the South African Democratic Teacher's Union (SADTU) initially called for an urgent moratorium on whole-school evaluation, claiming that it was being imposed on educators and was punitive and not developmental (SADTU, 2002:1).

According to the National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation (RSA, 2001:10), the main aims of whole-school evaluation are to: moderate externally, on a sampling basis, the results of self-evaluation carried out by the schools; evaluate the effectiveness of a school in terms of the national goals, using national criteria; increase the level of accountability within the education system; strengthen the support given to schools by district professional support services; provide feedback to all stakeholders as a means of achieving continuous school improvement; identify aspects of excellence within the system which will serve as models of good practice; identify the aspects of effective schools and improve the general understanding of what factors create effective schools.

The success of the above aims will depend on the knowledge, expertise and motivation of all stakeholders. Almost any education and training policy will come to grief in practice if it does not win the support of two essential constituencies: those who are expected to benefit from it and those who are expected to implement it. Coercion is a recipe for disaster (Claassen, 1999:14). Darling-Hammond (1990:240) concurs, maintaining that policy must be better communicated if it is to be well understood. Meaningful discussion and extensive professional development at all levels of the systems are critical components of such communication; directives are not enough. It is against this background that the African National Congress (1995:8) feels that the groundwork of education and training policy must be very carefully prepared if the policy is to find broad public acceptance and win the wholehearted support of education and training managers and practitioners.

Principals need to study all departmental policies in-depth so that they are able to impart their knowledge to their staff members, learners, parents and the community at large. Malcolm (2001:225) argues that school development, principal development and educator development have to fit together, reinforcing each other. As Bradshaw and Buckner (1994:78) put it, in this age of site-based management, all sectors of the school community must be involved if change efforts are to succeed.

Evaluation in education in general and whole-school evaluation in particular and the managerial roles of the principal are dealt with in more detail in chapters two and three respectively.

1.2 THE NATURE OF SOUTH AFRICAN SCHOOLS

According to the African National Congress (1995:3), the education and training system under apartheid was characterised by the following three features: first, the system was fragmented along racial and ethnic lines and had been saturated with the racial ideology and educational doctrines of apartheid; second, there was a lack of access or unequal access to education and training at all levels of the system; third, there was a lack of democratic control within the educational and training system. This created problems because the majority of oppressed communities; particularly black people received inferior education which did not serve the needs of all learners in the country. As a result since 1994, restructuring of the education system has been a top priority of the government (Van Wyk & Mothata, 1998:2).

Following the 1994 democratic elections, a non-racial education system based on the principle of equity was instituted, providing for central as well as provincial and local organisation of education (Van Wyk & Mothata, 1998:1). Thus, the South African education system changed from a racially differentiated system to a geographically differentiated system, thereby eliminating some of the duplication of the past government. However, disparities of the past have not yet been completely eliminated. Pretorius (1998:100) maintains that substantial disparities in South African education with regard to rural, township and suburban school settings still exist. These disparities have a major impact on the manner in which these schools operate. Thus, policy formulators should take the uniqueness of the schools into account, without compromising the standards of education. As Pretorius (1998:100) puts it, the implementation of each policy will have to be adapted to the unique circumstances of the various school learning settings.

Because of these disparities some learners attend schools which are well developed and resourced, while many others are still being taught in schools which are comparable with the worst in Africa. In principle, therefore, the new education system needs to redress the legacies of underdevelopment and inequality and to provide equal learning opportunities for all learners in the country (Van Wyk & Mothata, 1998:4). This is a process that is going to take time to accomplish. Van Wyk and Mothata (1998:4) and Chisholm (2000:4) regard the following as some of the things that still

hamper the previously disadvantaged schools: poor infrastructure; overcrowding; inadequate classrooms; under or unqualified educators and an absence of the technologies of teaching including educational resources such as textbooks; exercise books; pens and pencils.

While most schools in the townships are struggling in terms of the above, they are better off when compared to those schools that are in the rural areas. Most schools in the rural areas lack even the basic needs such as furniture, running water, flushing toilets and electricity. As Schwabe, Illing and Wilson (1996:48) put it, remote rural areas are the ones most affected by high learner-educator ratios. However, the Report on School Register of Needs 2000 (Department of Education, 2001a:x) maintains that there are significant improvements in provision of basic facilities such as sanitation, telecommunications, water provision, power supply, housing for educators, hostels for learners and access for learners who are physically disabled. However, in disadvantaged communities, much still needs to be done. What compounds the problems is that most previously disadvantaged schools have little or no access to the private sector for sponsors. As a result these schools rely heavily on school fees and/or government subsides.

Previously advantaged schools are well resourced, have strong parent support and have access to the private sector for supplemental materials and technologies (Vally & Spreen, 1998:14). Thus, conditions that are conducive for effective teaching and learning in former White schools and, to some extent, Indian and Coloured schools have prompted most parents who can afford to pay high school fees levied by these schools, particularly the former White schools, to take their children to these schools for quality education. While a number of black learners have flocked to the former White, Indian, Coloured schools, there is no evidence of White, Indian or Coloured learners moving to former Black school. These are some of the disparities that educational policies being introduced in the country aim to address. But De Clercq (1997a:127) warns that these policies are in danger of creating conditions that will assist the privileged education sector to consolidate its advantages while making it difficult for the disadvantaged to address their problematic educational realities. For example, the state redirected more funds to the historically disadvantaged schools, leaving the advantaged schools with more powers to decide on their fees. This as Badat (1997:11) suggests allows the white schools to increase their fees enormously, effectively putting such schools beyond the reach of the majority of black learners as most of black parents cannot pay such fees. Thus, only a small number of black learners attend the privileged schools, while the majority of them still continue to attend schools of poor quality (Fataar, 1997:72).

1.3 DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS/COMMUNITIES IN KWAZULU-NATAL

KwaZulu-Natal is one of the nine Provinces in South Africa. According to Schwabe et al (1996:3), in the past, KwaZulu-Natal was governed by two administrations. Formally, Natal fell under the jurisdiction of South African government and was administered by the Natal Provincial Administration (NPA) while KwaZulu was a semi-autonomous self-governing state and controlled by the KwaZulu government. Since the elections in April 1994, the Province's administration has been unified under the provincial government of KwaZulu-Natal. According to Statistics South Africa (2003:12), KwaZulu-Natal covers 92 100 square kilometres, which is 7.6 % of the land area of South Africa. Although the Province ranks number seven out of the nine Provinces in terms of size, census of 2001 reveals that it has the largest population which was 9 426 017 million or 21% of the entire population in the country. According to Statistics South Africa (2003:59), in 2001 there were 2 839 817 learners in KwaZulu-Natal. The Report on the School Register of Needs 2000 (Department of Education, 2001a:5) maintains that in 2000 there were 5 734 schools in KwaZulu-Natal.

IsiZulu speaking people who constituted 7 624 284 out of 9 426 017 people in 2001 predominantly populated KwaZulu-Natal (Statistics South Africa, 2003:25). In more cosmopolitan areas people speak IsiZulu, English, Afrikaans and vernacular languages. Dominant housing types vary from predominantly traditional dwellings in the rural areas to formal westernised housing in the urban areas (Schwabe el at, 1996:3). KwaZulu-Natal is a relatively poor region particularly in the rural areas. Like most if not all other townships in big cities in other Provinces, townships in big cities in KwaZulu-Natal are surrounded by informal settlements. Mazibuko (2003:60) maintains that these informal settlements mushroomed in the late 1980s and early 1990s. People who erected these shacks came from rural areas, mainly to look for job opportunities or as a result of faction clashes in rural areas. According to Schwabe et al (1996:3), KwaZulu-Natal and, more specifically, the districts in the rural areas within the Province need assistance from the National and Provincial governments to address the poor socio-economic conditions in the region and to provide services for the basic service needs of the people. As is the case in most parts of the country, it is mostly black people who live in poverty in KwaZulu-Natal. Schwabe et al (1996:24) are of the opinion that the basic needs of these people have to be addressed in order to draw them out of poverty and into the mainstream of the economy. They need to be provided with water, health facilities and also need access to education and training in order to be productive.

The provision of education in KwaZulu-Natal is beset by many problems. There is a shortage of adequate facilities which is aggravated by the rapid growth in learner enrolments (Schwabe et al, 1996:19). The Report on the School Register of Needs 2000 (Department of Education, 2001a:iv) shows that KwaZulu-Natal is among the Provinces with the largest proportion of schools (both primary and secondary schools) but these schools are still not enough to accommodate the growing numbers of learners enrolling. Although there is an increase in number of schools in KwaZulu-Natal, there is still a number of disadvantaged schools or areas (communities) in the Province. The Report on School Register on Needs 2000 survey shows unchanged learner-educator ratios of 34:1 between 1996 and 2000 (Department of Education, 2001a:21). However, Schwabe et al (1996:48) contend that it is in very few areas of KwaZulu-Natal where the learner -educator ratios for Africans are less than 40:1, some remote rural areas with ratios greater than 54:1. Schwabe et al (1996:43) maintain that most former KwaZulu areas are still disadvantaged. Thus, most disadvantaged schools and communities can be found in these areas. According to Schwabe et al (1996:53), clearly many predominantly black former KwaZulu areas are badly served educationally. While the present government is committed to providing equal education for all learners in the country, this move has not yet adequately addressed the problems that were experienced by schools and/or communities with poor educational background in the past. As Fataar (1997:72) points out, a privileged schooling sector still serves a minority and a poor quality schooling sector still serves the majority of children.

Schooling in disadvantaged schools and communities viewed from both local and international point of view is also covered in more detail in chapter three.

1.4 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

South African education is undergoing transformation (Claassen, 1999:v). As a result a number of policies that spell out new changes are being formulated. Whole-school evaluation, which is a system of evaluating schools that aims to ensure the maintenance and improvement of standards both in individual schools and in the education system as a whole, is one of these policy changes (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:8). Therefore, the principal as a head of the school should play a crucial role during this period of changes to ensure that everyone at school level understands these policy changes before implementation. But Dimmock and O' Donoghue (1997:5) contend that while it is widely acknowledged that the part which the school principal can play in managing the processes at

the school is a crucial factor in ensuring its restructuring and successful implementation, research on the principalship has failed to keep pace with this changing context.

The above background suggests that a need exists to investigate the managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation in the context of disadvantaged schools in KwaZulu-Natal. The focus is on disadvantaged schools since schooling in South Africa is still unequal. This will contribute to an understanding of the various aspects of the principal's work as part of current restructuring.

1.4.1 Formulation of the main research problem

What managerial roles does the principal play in whole-school evaluation in the context of disadvantaged schools in KwaZulu-Natal?

1.4.1.1 Formulation of sub-problems

According to Leedy (1993:13-14), to make the research problem more manageable, researchers usually divide the problem into sub-problems. Resolving the sub-problems will ultimately resolve the problem. It is against this background that the following questions have been formulated as sub-problems.

- What is whole-school evaluation and why has it been introduced in South African schools?
- What are the managerial roles of the school principal?
- What contextual issues impact on schooling in disadvantaged areas in KwaZulu-Natal?
- Which roles are school principals, particularly principals of disadvantaged schools, playing in whole-school evaluation?
- How can these findings contribute to strengthening the role of the principal in whole-school evaluation especially in the context of disadvantaged schools?

1.5 AIMS OF THE RESEARCH

In view of the above main research problem and sub-problems, the following aim and objectives are identified:

The main aim of this research is to investigate the managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation in the context of disadvantaged schools in KwaZulu-Natal.

The following objectives can be identified:

- To describe whole-school evaluation and to determine the reasons for the introduction of whole-school evaluation in South Africa.
- To investigate the managerial roles of the school principal.
- To investigate and identify contextual issues that impact on schooling in disadvantaged areas in KwaZulu-Natal.
- To identify and describe the role that the school principals, particularly principals of disadvantaged schools play in whole-school evaluation.
- To determine how these findings can contribute to strengthening the role of the school principal in whole-school evaluation.

In order to achieve the above main aim and objectives, a qualitative study has been undertaken. Data has been gathered to, among the other things, extend the body of knowledge concerning the managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation. Recommendations for improving the managerial role of the principal, particularly in the disadvantaged schools are made.

1.6 CLARIFICATION OF CONCEPTS

In order to gain a clear understanding of the managerial role of the principal, particularly principals of disadvantaged schools in whole-school evaluation; certain concepts should firstly be clarified. This is in line with what Ary, Jacobs and Razavich (2002:494) suggest, namely, that any terms or concepts that may not be familiar to the reader or those to which the author (researcher) is ascribing specific meaning should be defined and clarified in a way that they are used in the study. For the purpose of this study, therefore, whole-school evaluation, the managerial role of the school principal, and disadvantaged schools/communities are clarified, as they all have a bearing on the topic.

Whole-school evaluation

Whole-school evaluation is a system by which the quality of education provided by schools can be assessed. It links the evaluation carried out by schools themselves with an external evaluation carried out by national supervisors. According to the National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation (RSA, 2001:10), whole-school evaluation enables a school and external supervisors to provide an account of the school's current performance and to show to what extent it meets national goals and needs of the public and communities. Whole-school evaluation is not an end in itself, but the first step in the process of school improvement and quality enhancement (RSA, 2001:8). Whole-school evaluation helps the individuals within the school and the outsiders to understand the school in its totality. Thus, whole-school evaluation makes it possible to establish whether the school has successfully improved its performance and/or whether it has achieved its objectives.

The managerial role of the school principal

The managerial role of the school principal refers to the different roles that the school principal is required to perform in the school in order to ensure that the individual's and school's needs and goals are fulfilled. According to Everard and Morris (1996:4), the managerial role, as opposed to the teaching role, is to be the 'glue' that holds the organisation together. It is to direct not only the work of others in the school but also to show the route that the school should take. Van der Westhuizen (1991:32-33) concludes that policy and control, delegation and organisation, planning and guidance, interpersonal relationships and leadership, motivation and decision-making are integral parts of the managerial role. Therefore, the principal should inspire, motivate and support all role-players to understand and accept educational changes. As Burns (1996:350) puts it, the principal should change the behaviour and beliefs of all stakeholders in the school setup and unite them behind a new vision of the school's future.

Disadvantaged schools/communities

According to Mothata (2000:46), a disadvantaged school is a school that was or is suffering from severe economic and social disadvantage, often as a result of the previous discriminatory laws in education. These schools are characterised by buildings that are either poorly constructed or dilapidated, lack of facilities and equipment that facilitate education, a high incidence of dropouts

and absenteeism, and low morale and learners, staff and the parents of learners. These schools are found in historically under-resourced areas, namely townships and particularly rural and former homelands. Thus, they cater for the educational needs of black communities. This is the form of education system that the democratic government inherited.

1.7 DEMARCATION OF THE PROBLEM

According to Hoberg (1999:190), demarcating the problem means establishing the boundaries of the problem area within which the research will progress. Le Roux (2000:36) concurs and maintains that these boundaries are purposely put on the study, usually to narrow it down to ensure that the topic can be effectively researched. These "parameters" are usually stated in terms of *time*, *place* and *subject* (*participant*). Demarcating the problem helps to make it manageable because the researcher only focuses on aspects that have been identified or demarcated. This problem has been demarcated as follows:

A number of stakeholders at different levels are and/or should be responsible for whole-school evaluation. These stakeholders should play different roles to ensure that whole-school evaluation is implemented correctly. However, this research is confined to only the managerial roles that are or should be played by the school principal to ensure that whole-school evaluation is effectively and efficiently implemented at school level. The focus is on principals of disadvantaged schools in KwaZulu-Natal.

Time, financial constraints, limited resources and personal commitments limited the researcher to study a selected number of schools considered to be disadvantaged in KwaMashu area because the researcher is familiar with the locality. However, the sample of schools chosen and participants interviewed is consistent with qualitative research, which is used in this study. This small sample provided an in-depth understanding of the role principals perform in whole-school evaluation as seen through the eyes of the participants (Mazibuko, 2003:8).

1.8 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

According to Ary et al (1990:32-33), research method refers to the general strategy followed in gathering and analysing the data for answering the question at hand. It is the plan of attack the

problem under investigation. Le Roux (2000:36) maintains that all studies require an outline of the research methods where the issue of research methodology is discussed, described, planned and determined on the basis of the nature of the particular study. In order to determine the managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation, the researcher has undertaken the following:

- A literature study of both local and international sources is undertaken. The focus is on the managerial role of the principal, the management of change, quality assurance and whole school evaluation and disadvantaged schools and/or communities. This literature study/review serves as the framework for gathering of data. As Creswell (2003:30) puts it, literature review provides a framework for establishing the importance of the study as well as a benchmark for comparing the results of the study with other findings. According to McMillan and Schumacher (2001:108), literature reviews, if conducted carefully and presented well, add much to an understanding of the selected problem and help place the results of the study in a historical perspective. Without reviews of the literature, it would be difficult to build a body of accepted knowledge on an educational topic.
- A literature study of circulars, brochures, booklets, journals, educational legislation and newspaper articles concerning educational changes in South Africa and particularly whole-school evaluation as a new concept. This overview forms the background to the study and is necessary to place the qualitative research in context (Van Wyk, 1996:13). Glesne and Peshkin (1992:18) maintain that in qualitative research reviewing the literature is an ongoing process that cannot be completed before data collection and analysis. The data often suggest the need to review previously unexamined literature of both substantive and theoretical nature.
- A qualitative research is used to determine the perceptions of stakeholders of whole-school evaluation and the managerial role of the school principal in this endeavour. Qualitative research is an umbrella term used to refer to several strategies that share certain characteristics. The data collected, analysed, and interpreted is "rich in description of people, places, and conversations and is not easily handled by statistical procedures" (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003:2). This approach is used because the researcher aims at understanding the managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation within the context of disadvantaged schools from the participants' point of view. This is in accordance with McMillan and Schumacher (2001:396) that qualitative research is concerned with understanding the social phenomenon from the participants' perspective. Understanding is acquired by analysing the many contexts of the participants and by narrating participants' meanings for these situations and events. Tuckman

(1994:366) concurs and maintains that this is accomplished by determining what effects the setting, the participants and the observed phenomena have on each other.

Van Dalen (1979:158) maintains that many people are more willing to communicate orally than in writing and, therefore, will provide data more readily and fully in an interview than on a questionnaire. Thus, in this study the researcher used both individual and focus group interviews as data gathering techniques. Individual interviews were conducted with principals and Department of Education officials as they are considered to be particularly information rich, may have unique problems and experiences and may be reluctant to share these should other principals and/or departmental officials be present. Likewise, their busy schedules may present practical problems in arranging group discussions (Mazibuko, 2003:9). Van Dalen (1979:159) maintains that most interviews are conducted in a private setting with one person at a time so that the subject (participant) feels free to express himself/herself fully and truthfully. Meanwhile, focus group interviews are conducted with educators because Bogdan and Biklen (1992:100) suggest that bringing people together to talk about their work or those who work with their children is a good way of getting insights about what to pursue in individual interviews. When reflecting together on some topic, subjects (participants) often can stimulate each other to talk about topics that the researcher can explore later. McMillan and Schumacher (2001:455) concur, maintaining that by creating a social environment in which group members are stimulated by the perceptions and ideas of each other, one can increase the quality and richness of data through a more efficient strategy than one-on-one interviewing.

Research was conducted in four schools (two primary schools and two secondary schools) in KwaMashu area. This was done in order to determine whether primary school educators view the managerial role of the school principal in whole-school evaluation in the same manner as secondary school educators. These schools were chosen on the basis of their accessibility and willingness to be included in the research (Mazibuko, 2003:9). Although it cannot be claimed that the chosen schools are the most typical of schools in the area, they can be said to be *in some important way* like the majority (Wolcott, 1995:174).

The following participants were interviewed:

- Individual interviews were conducted with principals of both primary and secondary schools considered *disadvantaged* and that mainly serve a disadvantaged community. This was done in order to determine how these principals view their managerial role in whole-school evaluation and also to find out how they see their role as transformational leaders, and in educational changes in general. The inclusion of both primary and secondary school principals was also done in order to see whether their perceptions regarding their managerial role in whole-school evaluation differed significantly or not and to establish what training had they been offered in whole-school evaluation, transformational leadership and/or educational changes/policies in general.
- Individual interviews were also conducted with four officials of the Department of Education. Out of the four officials, two were Superintendents of Education Management involved in the training of school principals. The other two officials were external evaluators (supervisors) who are responsible for quality assurance and/or whole-school evaluation. Interviews with the two superintendents of Education Management were conducted in order to ascertain what training is being offered to school principals to ensure that they deal with educational changes effectively and efficiently. Meanwhile, interviews with the two external evaluators (supervisors) were conducted in order to find out how they conduct whole-school evaluation in the schools and also to establish their perceptions and experiences during their visits to different schools.
- Focus group interviews were conducted with four educators from each of the four schools chosen (two primary and two secondary schools). These interviews were conducted in order to determine whether they knew what role should the principal play in whole-school evaluation and to determine if they understood whole-school evaluation and its implications, more especially in the context of disadvantaged schools/communities. They were also done to establish how they view educational changes that are taking place in South Africa.

In total four principals, four Department of Education officials (two superintendents of Education Management and two external evaluators) and sixteen educators were included in the study.

In qualitative research, interviews may be used into two ways. They may be the dominant strategy for data collection or they may be employed in conjunction with participant observation, document analysis or other techniques. In all of these situations the interview is used to gather descriptive data

in the participants' own words so that the researcher can develop insights on how participants interpret some piece of the world (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:95). In this study the interviews were preceded by a period of participant observation in the chosen schools. This was done in order for the researcher to gain a degree of entry into the conceptual world of the participants (Van Wyk, 1996:15). Glesne and Peshkin (1992:71) are of the opinion that interviewing that is preceded by or accompanied with participant observation creates chances to derive some questions from sheer fortuity. The period of participant observation also fulfils the function of identifying educators who could possibly be participants during further investigations (Van Wyk, 1996:15).

Bodgan and Biklen (2003:121) recommend the use of a tape recorder when a study involves extensive interviewing or when interviewing is the major technique in the study. Tape recording the interview ensures completeness of the verbal interaction and provides material for reliability checks (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:396). It was against this background that interviews in this study were recorded and tapes were later transcribed for closer examination. Data analysis was done according to techniques described in the literature for qualitative research analysis (Van Wyk, 1996:13). This research was designed to be exploratory and descriptive, as a result no attempts were made to establish cause and effect relationships under experimental conditions. The primary aim of the enquiry was to understand and describe how the participants perceive the role of the principal in whole-school evaluation from their *own frame of reference*, particularly within the context of disadvantaged schools.

The methodology is discussed in more detail in chapter four.

1.9 PROGRAMME OF STUDY

The study is divided into six chapters. These can be distinguished as follows:

Chapter 1

This chapter provides an orientation to the problem, problem formulation, aims and methodology to be followed.

Chapter 2

This chapter consists of a review of the literature which provides a conceptual and a theoretical framework for the study. In this chapter prevailing theories and studies of evaluation (in education) in general and whole-school evaluation in particular are examined. Emphasis is placed on whole-school evaluation in the context of South African schools as this is regarded as the crux of this study. Attention is also given to the responsibilities of the major role-players in whole-school evaluation.

Chapter 3

This chapter also deals with a review of literature that provides the theoretical background to the managerial role of the principal. It looks at how the managerial role of the principal is viewed from both local and international point of view. Schooling in disadvantaged schools/communities worldwide in general and in the South African context in particular is also explored in this chapter.

Chapter 4

Chapter four deals with the research methodology and the procedures followed in the study (cf 1.8). This chapter discusses how the study is designed and conducted. It describes the selection of participants and the manner in which the interviews were conducted. It also focuses on how data were collected. In short, the chapter looks at all the steps that were followed in order to investigate the research problem.

Chapter 5

In this chapter an exposition of data analysis is given. The analysis of data collected is described and the findings of the research are spelt out.

Chapter 6

This final chapter deals with a synopsis of the findings arising from the study. The conclusions suggest the managerial role school principals should play in whole-school evaluation. Finally, problematic areas of the study are discussed and recommendations for further research are given.

1.10 SUMMARY

Since South Africa transformed from a racially divided to a non-racial society in 1994, there have been a number of drastic changes in all spheres. The education system has been heavily affected and influenced by these changes. As a result a number of policy changes have been introduced to ensure that South African education keeps pace with other changes in the country and in other countries as well. In some quarters these changes bring about uncertainty, fear and dissatisfaction as they inevitably change roles that are played by the individuals in the school. Therefore, it should be established whether those that are to implement these policies understand what role they should play in order for these policies to be successfully implemented.

Whole-school evaluation is one of these policy changes. Naicker and Waddy (2002:8) regard whole-school evaluation as a system (of evaluating schools) that aims to ensure the maintenance and improvement of standards both in individual schools and in the education system as a whole. It is, therefore, imperative that every individual in the school should not only understand whole-school evaluation but should also understand the importance of this (whole-school evaluation) for quality control, school improvement as well as the improvement of the individual staff member.

It is at school level where educational policies are implemented and it is for this reason, therefore, that the role of the school principal is paramount important. Thus, in this study attempt is made to investigate the managerial role of the school principal in whole-school evaluation, particularly in the context of disadvantaged schools, as whole-school evaluation is one of the new policies. The school principal is the head of the school; therefore, his/her role should be clearly understood by everyone associated with the school. In this study a qualitative approach has been adopted. Both individual and focus group interviews have been used as data gathering techniques.

Literature review both local and international is done in the next chapters (chapter 2 and chapter 3). This is done in order to establish how evaluation in education in general and whole-school evaluation in particular, the managerial roles of the school principal and disadvantaged schools/communities are viewed from both local and international point of view.

CHAPTER 2

EVALUATION IN EDUCATION AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Many education systems of the world are initiating radical reforms in order to adapt to this changing world (Pretorius, 1998:109). South Africa is no exception to these reforms. Since South Africa transformed to a democratically governed country, a number of policy changes have been introduced. As Pretorius (1998:v) puts it, when a country experiences a change of government, policy changes are inevitable. Van der Horst and McDonald (2003:20) are of the opinion that educational reform can be introduced by means of a number of different approaches. Whole-schools evaluation is one of those policies that have been recently introduced in South African schools. According to the Department of Education (2001b:5), this approach is designed to help schools measure to what extent they are fulfilling their responsibilities and improving their performance, whilst providing an external evaluation of the school's work.

Van Wyk (1999a:45-46) is of the opinion that policy changes introduced in South African schools need to be researched as they are being implemented in the South African context. This has to be done while taking cognisance of factors such as poorly resourced schools in many communities, a sluggish economy, under-qualified educators and a poor teaching and learning climate in many schools. It is, therefore, important to understand how these factors affect the implementation of policies being introduced in the country. According to Van Wyk (1999a:46), these factors can even lead to some policies having to be reviewed or adapted. Meanwhile, Van der Horst and McDonald (2003:3) maintain that sound educational policies and proper implementation of such policies have the potential to improve the quality of life of the people of a country. But proper implementation can only take place if implementers not only understand the policy but also understand their respective roles in the implementation of the policy well. Thus, it is necessary to ascertain whether new policies are correctly implemented and evaluated.

Therefore, this section looks at evaluation in education as an essential management task as well as forms of evaluations as set out in both international and local literature. The literature study has also

looked at whole-school evaluation as one of the new policies being implemented in South African schools from both the international and national point of view.

2.2 EVALUATION IN EDUCATION : AN ESSENTIAL MANAGEMENT TASK

Evaluation has many faces and different people mean different things when they use the word evaluation (Nevo, 1995:7). Thus, different individuals emphasise evaluation for different reasons. For example, some people put the emphasis on evaluation as a means of finding out what is happening with the school and other emphasise evaluation in order to hold the school accountable. However, Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:84) contend that because of educators' experience with evaluation in South Africa in the past, evaluation is often considered in a negative light. According to Quinlan and Davidoff (1997:3), evaluation was generally concerned with bureaucratic efficiency and social control rather than professional development. As a result the evaluation system has continuously emerged as one of the most deeply resented aspects of the education system. However, Nevo (1994:92) is of the opinion that some of the resistance which some individuals in the school show could be a result of misperceptions. Therefore, an attempt should be made to clarify the meaning of evaluation and develop a common understanding of its role in the school.

According to Eisner (1994:171), evaluation is used in education to perform a wide variety of functions. Of the functions of evaluation in education, the following five seem especially important: to diagnose; to revise curricula; to compare; to anticipate educational needs and to determine if objectives have been achieved. It is, therefore, important to realise the existence of the various evaluation functions and the value of these functions to the education system. Nevo (1995:28) maintains that the basic function of evaluation is to get a better understanding of the nature of the evaluated object and its quality. Such understanding can serve formative functions such as planning, monitoring or improvement and summative functions such as selection, accreditation or accountability. As Root and Overly (1990:36) put it, evaluation strategy should be designed for the purpose of gathering data to improve performance (formative evaluation) and to collect data to make decisions concerning promotion or re-employment (summative evaluation). Likewise, Drake and Roe (1999:279) agree that evaluation is essential to the continual improvement of the quality of life of each individual within the school, including both learners and educators. Like learners and educators, schools need to be evaluated. This is done in order to determine whether schools are fulfilling their mandate, that is, educative teaching. As Blandford (2000:139) puts it, evaluation is

an overall check on whether objectives are achieved within the planned timetable. But Potter and Powell (1992:122) argue that evaluation of any aspect of school management or curriculum is best achieved in the context of clearly stated criteria. Cullingford (1997:119) concurs and maintains that when school systems are evaluated in the light of a desire for improvement, certain ground rules emerge. Those that are responsible for evaluation should not only know these rules and/or criteria but should also understand how to apply them so that evaluation should be effective. But Nevo (1995:14) maintains that to choose criteria by which to judge the merit of an evaluation object or some of its dimensions is one of the most difficult and controversial tasks in educational evaluation.

Nevo (1995:43) regards improvement as an ongoing need of the school (organisation): learners have to improve their performance; educators have to improve their teaching and their teaching skills; curricula materials have to be continuously updated and improved and the school as a whole has to continuously improve itself in order to compete with other schools or as a response to request for innovation and modernisation. Evaluation is the mechanism to determine if there is indeed an improvement in all these. Therefore, any evaluation that is conducted in the school should always focus on *improvement* of the object or individual that is being evaluated. Thus, evaluation should always lead to strategies that can be used to address problems that were picked up or identified during the evaluation. For example, Eisner (1994:184) is of the opinion that without evaluating teaching as well as the curriculum, it is not possible to know when there are difficulties and what their sources are. The same can be said about any object of evaluation, including the school. As a result Nevo (1995:7) is of the opinion that evaluation is viewed as a constructive tool for *improvement* and *innovation*. Therefore, evaluation should be seen as one important step in the ongoing process of strategic planning that is needed to ensure the development of a good school (Davidoff and Lazarus, 2002:86). Drake and Roe (1999:280) add that the process of evaluation is linked with decision making because improvement cannot result from evaluation unless implied changes are implemented. Meanwhile, Cullinford (1997:113) contends that when it comes to evaluating schools, the emphasis is not so much on measurement as on finding out which activities or type of approach will lead to improvement.

According to Hopkins, Jackson, West and Terrell (1997:158), school evaluation can take place according to three approaches, namely, evaluation *of* school improvement, evaluation *for* school improvement and evaluation *as* school improvement. Hopkins et al (1997:162-164), when expanding on this, maintain that evaluation *of* school improvement is usually concerned with

evaluating the outcomes of improvement efforts or a particular initiative. This evaluation of school improvement tends to be *product evaluations*, dealing primarily with quantitative and statistical data. Evaluation *for* school improvement is evaluation conducted with the purpose of bringing about improvements in practice. The critical features of this evaluation approach are that its prime focus is the facilitation of change. Lastly, evaluation *as* school improvement occurs when the evaluation has an explicit school improvement purpose and when those who will be involved in the development are also engaged in the evaluation. Without evaluation it can be difficult to determine whether the school is achieving its ultimate goals and/or is improving. Thus, evaluation should focus on achievements as well as areas that require improvement (Blandford, 2000:39). According to Hopkins et al (1997:160), school improvement is about curriculum development, the strength in the school organisation, the teaching/learning process and a developmental approach. Hopkins et al (1997:160) also contend that such an approach to evaluation focuses attention on the process of strengthening the school's capacity to deal with change and ensuring a belief in the school improvement agenda. This suggests that evaluation is the key factor in the school effectiveness and school improvement as activities or tasks taking place in the school need to be evaluated in order to identify the strengths and weaknesses of these activities or tasks. According to Van der Westhuizen (1991:221), the quality and functionality of tasks (activities) are measured by means of evaluation. Van der Westhuizen (1991:221), however, cautions that not everything can be evaluated. Efficacy, quality, extent and results achieved by executing tasks may, however, be evaluated. Nevo (1995:42) maintains that evaluation can serve many needs at various levels of the educational system but at the school level there are five major needs that can and should be served by evaluation. These are related to decision-making, improvement, accountability, professionalism and certification.

Cullingford (1997:3) argues that the process of evaluation is generally far more deep-seated and is directed at the structural features of situations. Thus, evaluation can be formative or summative. Oldroyd, Elsner and Poster (1996:24) regard formative evaluation as making judgements about a process or project while it is in progress in order to improve. On the other hand, summative evaluation is making a final judgement at the completion of a process or project to sum up results. Summative evaluation and formative evaluation are distinct in purpose but each process must inform the other. Thus, summative and formative modes of evaluation work with – not against – each other (Dagley & Orso, 1991:75-76). As a result Nevo (1995:55) argues that the concept of formative evaluation stresses the importance of evaluation being constructive and useful but in certain cases it has created an unjustified excuse to avoid demands for accountability by suggesting

that formative evaluation is an alternative to summative evaluation. Nevo (1995:55) also contends that the tendency to avoid summative evaluation is especially disturbing when it occurs in innovative or experimental schools that use formative evaluation to improve their operation but seem to forget that they should also have summative evaluation to demonstrate their merit as a viable alternative to conventional schools. If formative evaluation and summative evaluation are used as related procedures, they are more likely to produce both individual and school improvement.

2.2.1 The purpose of evaluation

According to Dagley and Orso (1991:72), the focus on school reform brings to light the need for both accountability and improvement. Tools of choice for each respectively have become evaluation and supervision. Supervision involves monitoring what goes on in schools and classrooms to ensure that policy is being implemented at school level (Potterton, 2004:66). Mayo (1997:269) contends that evaluation is expected to foster educator's development and growth. Educator development is one of the pre-requisites of school development and improvement. In the school where there are no staff development programmes it is highly unlikely that the school can develop and/or improve. The purpose of evaluation is, therefore, to determine the extent to which goals, needs and priorities of the school have been addressed and/or achieved.

The purposes of evaluation range from ensuring that minimum standards are being met and those educators are being faithful to the school's overall purposes and educational platform, to helping educators grow and develop as individuals and professionals (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988:352). Thus, all activities taking place in the school need to be evaluated in order to ascertain whether they meet the individual's as well as the school's objectives. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988:352) group the purposes of evaluation into three major categories:

- Quality control: Here the supervisor is responsible for monitoring teaching and learning and does so by visiting classrooms, touring the school, talking with people and visiting with learners.
- Professional development: Helping educators to grow and to develop in their understanding of teaching and classroom life, in improving basic teaching skills, and in expanding their knowledge and use of teaching repertoires

- Educator motivation: Building and nurturing motivation and commitment to teaching, to the school's overall purposes and to the school's defining educational platform.

Nevo (1995:13) contends that evaluation should not be limited to the evaluation of learners or school personnel only; almost everything taking place in the school can be an object of evaluation. Everard and Morris (1996:263) concur and maintain that the existence and purpose of the evaluation should be communicated to those involved and /or to be affected by the evaluation. Individuals should, therefore, be made aware as to why evaluation should be conducted and most importantly how it is to benefit them.

2.2.2 Types of evaluation

Many types of evaluations exist and some of these are more effective than others. Thus, various countries use different types (forms) of evaluation for a variety of reasons. For example, some countries use appraisal as a form of evaluation, while others use inspection as a form of evaluation. According to Ormston and Shaw (1993:65), appraisal (evaluation) is not judgemental – it is about using a partnership to make informed judgements with the view to supportive development. Inspection is also about making informed judgements but with a view to reportage. This, it is argued is, however, not developmental. Jones (1993:122) contends that whatever form the evaluation takes, the outcomes should be considered seriously and changes made in the interests of improving the scheme (the activity). Likewise, many schools have well-developed teaching and learning policies (Lacey, 1996:25). The effectiveness of these policies should, however, be evaluated by means of various forms of evaluation.

Each type of evaluation is conducted following its own procedures. Cullingford (1997:5) warns that no particular type of evaluation should be applied rigidly as this approach can create problems. But whatever type of evaluation is being used, it should determine whether or not the objectives of the project or activity are achieved. As Drake and Roe (1999:298) conclude, evaluation that does not result in decisions probably is nonfunctional or even dysfunctional. Therefore, any type of evaluation that is adopted should lead to the making of an informed decision. Two types (forms) of evaluation, namely inspection and appraisal are discussed in the ensuing sections.

2.2.2.1 Inspection as a form of evaluation

The school's commitment to use evaluation to identify opportunities for development has been reinforced by inspection (Hopkins et al, 1997:169). Oldroyd et al (1996:34) regard inspection as the process of visiting an institution (the school) in order to collect evidence for a systematic evaluation. However, in some cases, inspections have tended to be a threatening and negative experience (Quinlan & Davidoff, 1997:1). Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:84) concur and maintain that in South Africa the history of inspection and control of schools has provided many reasons to feel negative and to be cynical of any evaluation process. Educators who have developed a negative attitude towards inspection cannot benefit by it and the whole exercise (inspection) can become a futile exercise.

Fidler and Davies (1998:154) are of the opinion that the way in which a school approaches the inspection process is a major determinant of how the schools and staff members will subsequently view the developmental potential of inspection. Lonsdale and Parsons (1998:125) concur, basing their arguments on the perceptions of the governors, educators, principals and senior managers they interviewed in their research. These perceptions differed widely depending on the nature of school, the nature of the inspection and the nature of their role. According to Lonsdale and Parsons (1998:125), in schools in England with little systematic planning, poor evaluation and monitoring, Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) provided valuable impetus. But in the vast majority schools OFSTED has caused considerable disruption to the normal life of the school. In some 'failing' schools it has highlighted deficiencies and put huge pressure on Local Education Authorities (LEAs) to rectify the situation.

For Hopkins et al (1997:169) inspection is clearly an important vehicle, conveying evaluation for school improvement onto the agenda of all schools. If inspection can be seen in this light educators and schools will develop a positive attitude towards it and subsequently co-operate with the inspectors. In contrast, however, Earley (1998:111) regards inspection as a punitive process that is unlikely to motivate workers (educators and other individuals in the school) to achieve higher standards. Quinlan and Davidoff (1997:3) contend that in South Africa's case there was often no shared understanding between inspectors and educators of what was expected from the evaluation process. As a result a new form of evaluation, namely developmental appraisal, has replaced inspection in South Africa and other countries. But in countries like England, Scotland and Wales

inspection is still being used as a form of evaluation. However, Earley (1998:12) maintains that the system of inspection is slightly different for Wales; in Scotland the emphasis is much more on school self-evaluation.

According to Earley (1998:1), the inspection of school in England is carried out under the auspices of the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) and that the work of the OFSTED and the process of school inspection have generated much discussion and controversy. As a result OFSTED and the system of inspection associated with it have not gone unchallenged. For example, Lonsdale and Parsons (1998:110) question the ability of OFSTED to fulfill its mission of improvement through inspection. They argue that the position occupied by OFSTED in the educational administrative and political structure of England render the inspection process illegitimate and disqualifies the agency itself from playing a supportive and developmental role; the content of reports and the reporting requirements as set out in the handbook for inspection are oppositional in character despite their claim to represent best practice and high standards; and the stretched chain of responsibility from National government to school and the purposely emasculated mediating potential of the LEA (Local Education Authority) make the exercise of school inspection one of improvement through threat and fear, an intentionally disciplining role. Despite these shortfalls, inspection as a form of evaluation is still being used in some countries.

2.2.2.2 Appraisal as a form of evaluation

Appraisal is seen to be the most effective form of evaluation in schools where the prime aim is to overtly develop staff and where the appraiser and appraisee engage in a professional partnership to enable this to happen in the most helpful way (Ormaston & Shaw, 1993:65). Steyn (2002b:278) concurs and adds that if appraisal could be seen as something positive that provides a means of expressing appreciation for educators' work and as offering support and improving the quality of teaching, it would be more likely to be well received. With careful planning and correct attitude, staff appraisal can be implemented in a positive and professional way. Therefore, for appraisal to be successful all staff members should be actively involved in the process. As Quinlan and Davidoff (1997:5) put it, without direct involvement in the change processes any new system remains something that has been imposed upon the educators. The same principle applies to appraisal.

According to Steyn (2002b:280), because appraisal is so closely linked to an educator's performance, personal qualities and beliefs, it is viewed as a very delicate issue. Thus, a favourable climate where there is trust and openness between those involved in the appraisal system should be created. Squelch and Lemmer (1994:113) contend that schools should have an effective appraisal system to improve and maintain a high standard of teaching. Likewise, Steyn (2002b:297) concurs and maintains that appraisal systems have the potential to develop educators professionally and to improve quality of schooling – a dire need in many schools. Therefore, everyone involved should know and also understand the reasons behind the introduction of this form of evaluation (appraisal) in schools. Squelch and Lemmer (1994:133) are of the opinion that one of the important aims of appraisal as a form of evaluation is to identify educators' professional and development needs in order to help them to reach their potential by improving skills and performance through appropriate in-service training. As a result schools should have appraisal programmes in place in order to help educators to analyse their current work standard in order to build on their strengths and identify improvement areas (Lacey, 1996:vii).

Appraisal plays a crucial role in organisations (schools) because it deals with the question of what staff members are meant to do. It also specifies required outcomes and defines desired as well as required staff member behaviours (Steyn, 2002b:276). Therefore, each staff member is or should be appraised in order to ascertain whether his/her work is up to the required standard. Lacey (1996:3) maintains that an appraisal can be conducted for individual educator or school improvement. By doing so educators and schools are able to identify specific aspects of performance for development and to improve teaching performance in this area. Appraisal is, therefore, an important form of evaluation for both improvement and accountability. Lacey (1996:3-4) regards appraisal for improvement as a form of evaluation that encourages educators to identify specific areas of their teaching practice for focus improvement. Thus, effective appraisal for improvement is about identifying and building on strengths and seeking individual improvement. It is not about competence. Meanwhile, appraisal for accountability enables the employer to ensure that teaching standards of individual educators are at least satisfactory.

2.3 WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION : THE GENERAL FRAMEWORK

The whole-school evaluation framework must be understood as a tool both for the improvement of a school's performance and the more effective accountability of the school system (Department of

Education, 2000b:2). According to McNamara, O'Hara and Ní Aingléis (2002:205), the general framework of whole-school evaluation is that the emphasis of the evaluation is on the work of the school as a whole and that individual educators are not identified in the whole-school evaluation reports. Although educators and other support staff are one of the most important components in the school, the focus in whole-school evaluation is not much on their performance but rather on the school as a whole.

According to the Department of Education (2000b:8), a key component of whole-school evaluation is the shift from individual educator evaluation to school evaluation. Thus, the emphasis is on the quality of teaching and learning across the system. As the National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation (RSA, 2001:6) puts it, recognising the importance of schools as the place in which the quality of education is ultimately determined, focus should be primarily on the school as a whole rather than simply on individuals and their performance. This, therefore, implies that the school should be understood in its totality. This does not, however, mean that individual educator evaluation has thus become less important. Just like the school as a whole, the strengths and weaknesses of the individual educators should be identified in order to provide the necessary support. Blandford (2000:142) argues that school improvement will not happen without professional development for both the individual and the institution. Whole-school evaluation should, therefore, be conducted in order to create an environment where both the individual and the school could develop so that they should provide quality education.

Whole-school evaluation is not an end in itself, but the first step in the process of school improvement and quality education (RSA, 2001:8). In contrast, Coburn (1998:3) basing her argument on the interviews she conducted with some British educators, is of the opinion that there is danger that school evaluation can virtually become an end in itself, assuming an importance that actually eclipses the real work of teaching school subjects and attending to everyday learner needs. However, there are many whole-school evaluation models that differ in approach and scope. These models all have their own unique strengths and limitations (cf 1.1).

The whole-school evaluation model followed in South African schools is based on indicators covering inputs, processes and outputs (RSA, 2001:13). This is in accordance with Killen's (1999:1) argument that the quality of educational system can be judged from three basic perspectives, namely the inputs to the system, what happens within the system and the outputs from

the system. The National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation (RSA, 2001:14-15) regards the input as what the school has been provided with in order to carry out its task. Thus, the *input* indicators include the main characteristics of each grade of learners, the school infrastructure, funding and professional and support staff. *Processe*s relate to how the school seeks to achieve its goals. Thus, process indicators include the effectiveness with which schools try to ensure effective governance, leadership and management, safety and security measures and the quality of teaching. *Outputs* relate to what the school achieves and output indicators include achievements in academic standards, standards of behaviour and rates of punctuality and attendance. Killen (1999:1) warns that all aspects of education are important and that quality should not be judged from any narrow perspective.

2.3.1 Reasons for introducing whole-school evaluation in South African schools

Since 1994, restructuring of the education system has been a top priority of the South African government. As a result various commissions have been appointed to investigate different aspects of the education system (Van Wyk & Mothata, 1998:2). This has led to a number of educational and policy changes being introduced. Pretorius (1998:109) maintains that education systems are compelled to react to changes taking place in the country. The school should, therefore, react to such changes by adapting through constant development. Whole-school evaluation is one of the policy changes/approaches that have been recently initiated in order to reform the education system in the South African context.

According to Lemmer (1998:117), in South Africa, quality procedures in the past were characterised by differentiated top-down quality controls. Lemmer argues that despite being characterised by highly prescriptive top-down procedures, the previous system of education was unable to monitor and develop quality. Whole-school evaluation as a new approach has, therefore, been introduced in order to ensure that quality education is maintained at school level. The concern for quality should be a cornerstone of the school's daily life (Murgatroyd, 1991:15). For quality education to take place in the school, all role-players should be actively involved in the decision-making processes.

According to Steyn (2002a:264), whole-school evaluation has been introduced in South African schools in order to provide world-class education to South African learners by putting standards of

excellence into action. Looking at what is happening in the school as a whole in order to be able to help the school improve would, thus, do this. This, therefore, implies that the school should be understood and evaluated as a whole. Whole-school evaluation was adopted after it was realised that the school inspection system was not effective as it mostly looked to the individuals and their performance and little attention was paid to what was happening in the school as whole. According to Quinlan and Davidoff (1997:4), educators often received no feedback from inspectors observing their work and are often unaware of the criteria that were being used by the inspectors to judge their teaching. Often the evaluation was a once off event. Most importantly, the educators often never saw reports after the inspection and therefore the evaluation did not contribute towards the development of the educators. In addition, the Department of Education (2000c:1) maintains that the inspection system had flaws, as most inspectors were not all specialists in any particular field. According to Sack (2002:6), the whole-school reform movement was originally designed to link all educational services in a school into a coherent vision that would drive change rather than piecemeal approaches that might make no difference. Whole-school evaluation should, therefore, be conducted in order to ascertain the functionality of the school as a whole so that intervention at the whole school level should be provided. For the school to improve, school evaluation and educator evaluation should complement each other. For example, school support in Australia uses a mixture of whole-school development and individual educator development (Malcolm, 2001:225).

According to the National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation (RSA, 2001:6), whole-school evaluation has been introduced to serve as an effective monitoring and evaluation process that is vital to the improvement of quality and standards of performance in South African schools.

2.3.2 The key principles of whole-school evaluation

In order to understand the significance of whole-school evaluation in the education system in South Africa, it is necessary to explain the underlying principles of the policy. According to the National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation (RSA, 2001:11), the policy is based on the following principles:

(a) The core mission of schools is to improve the educational achievements of all learners. Whole-school evaluation, therefore, is designed to enable teaching and non-teaching staff, supervisors and support services to identify to what extent the school is adding value to learners' prior

knowledge, understanding and skills (RSA, 2001:11). Likewise, Kruger and Van Schalkwyk (1997:4) maintain that the success and effectiveness of a school and education system are determined by what takes place in the classrooms or the learning groups. Thus, whatever happens in the school should always be for the benefit of the learners.

(b) The National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation (RSA, 2001:11) maintains that all members of a school community have responsibility for the quality of their own performance. Therefore, whole-school evaluation intends to enable the contribution made by staff, learners and other stakeholders to improve their own and the school's performance, to be properly recognised. It is, therefore, the responsibility of all stakeholders to ensure that there is quality education in schools.

(c) Evaluation activities must be characterised by openness and collaboration. Therefore, the criteria to be used in evaluating schools must be made public (RSA, 2001:11). According to the Department of Education (2001b:3), the criteria indicate what questions supervisors should ask and provide descriptors that guide them on how to interpret the criteria. The European Commission (2001:4), using Ireland as an example, maintains that the evaluation criteria developed for external evaluation as standards of quality provide schools with a basis for evaluating themselves and for identifying strengths and areas for further development. Thus, schools are encouraged to use these criteria for the purpose of self-evaluation (internal evaluation).

(d) Good quality whole-school evaluation must be standardised and consistent. Therefore, the guidelines, criteria and instruments must ensure consistency over periods of time and across settings (RSA, 2001:11). The Department of Education (2000b:2) maintains that the use of criteria and the pre-set instruments should help standardise the process until such time that the policies or guidelines are changed.

(e) The evaluation of both qualitative and quantitative data is essential when deciding how well a school is performing. For this reason, whole-school evaluation is concerned with the range of inputs, processes and outcomes (RSA, 2001:11). These three aspects are all important in determining the quality of teaching and learning in the school. The National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation (RSA, 2001:11) associates these aspects with staffing, physical resources, human resources, the quality of leadership and management, learning and teaching and also the standards achieved by learners.

(f) The National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation (RSA, 2001:11) regards staff development and training as crucial to school improvement. As a result a measure used by whole-school

evaluation in judging a school's performance is the amount and quality of in-service training undertaken by staff and its impact on learning and standards of achievement. As Du Four and Berkey (1995:2) point out, focusing on people is the most effective way to change any organisation. Thus, for the school to improve, staff development programmes should be developed. If the staff has been well developed there are more likely to provide quality teaching to the learners. Thus, whole-school evaluation attempts to establish what developmental programmes are in place to assist the staff develop and also to find out if those programmes are effective in terms of enabling educators to be more effective in their duties.

(g) The National Policy on Whole-school Evaluation (RSA, 2001:11) acknowledges that schools are at different stages of development. This is caused by a combination of various factors. Therefore, attempts should be made to understand schools taking into consideration their own particular circumstances. The Department of Education (2000b:6) maintains that whole-school evaluation intends to affirm those schools that perform well and assist those that are under-performing. Thus, schools in disadvantaged areas must not be disadvantaged in terms of whole-school evaluation (RSA, 2001:11).

2.3.3 Areas for evaluation in whole-school evaluation

Demands are increasingly being made on schools to demonstrate that they are effective and that they are improving. Pressure has been exerted on them to find ways of enhancing achievement, to raise standards and for their own survival (if nothing else) to attract learners (Earley, 1998:168). Thus, to ascertain whether the school meets these demands and/or fulfils its mandate, certain areas need to be evaluated and these areas should be identified. The areas for evaluation constitute the major aspects of the school's work (Department of Education, 2001d:1). All role-players should know which areas are to be evaluated. This can minimise confusion, as everyone in the school knows what is expected of him/her.

Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:19) maintain that in every school there are particular aspects or elements that make up that organisation and that each of these needs to be functioning healthy for the whole to be healthy. Any unhealthy or malfunctioning element will have a negative effect throughout the system. The Department of Education (2001d:2) identifies the following areas for evaluation:

2.3.3.1 Basic functionality of the school

The main function of the school is to make sure that teaching and learning take place effectively. Thus, evaluation is designed to judge whether the basic conditions exist in the school to enable it to function efficiently and effectively and realise the educational and social goals set for it by the local and National community (Department of Education, 2001d:8). This can help to ascertain whether or not the school is capable of carrying out its functional task, which is, educative-teaching. Thus, supervisors must make judgements and report on the effectiveness of the following: the school policies and procedures; the level of absence, lateness and truancy and the procedures for dealing with them; learners' response to the school's provision and the behaviour of the learners (Department of Education, 2001d:8).

Van der Horst and McDonald (2003:236) regard the educator as the main agent for the promotion of a culture of teaching and learning. Therefore, in order for learners to learn effectively, the school requires good educators who, in turn, need a supportive school environment (Quinlan & Davidoff, 1997:12). Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:xv) concur and maintain that educator's commitment to quality classroom practice depends, to a great extent, on how the school environment can support their endeavours. Therefore, conditions in the school should be always conducive for effective teaching and learning. Policies and procedures should be such that they do not become hindrance to both the educators and learners, as this can create a negative attitude to them against the school. As Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:xv) put it, it is very important to create an environment at the school that is enabling, that is, which supports educators in a lifelong process of personal and professional development. This, in turn, will create a supportive environment within which learners can learn and develop, developing their own potential for the benefit of society as a whole.

2.3.3.2 Leadership, management and communication

At the heart of school life are leadership, management and governance. It is these aspects of school life that ensure that all other aspects are held together and developed (Davidoff & Lazarus, 2002:36). Thus, the key purpose of evaluating this area is to assess the effectiveness of the leadership and management of the school at the various levels in the management structure (Department of Education, 2001d:9). Effective educative-teaching can only take place in a school that is well managed at every level. Therefore, it is not only the principal who plays a crucial role in

the functioning of the school; other leaders in the school play a critical role. These include deputy principal/s, head of departments and senior educators. Together, they form the school management team. These individuals can only be effective if they work as a team. As Pretorius (1998:105) puts it, a true culture of teamwork is imperative. Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:37) concur and maintain that a healthy school is one in which leadership and management capacity is developed in all staff members and other constituencies, through ongoing personal and professional development processes.

The key to full realisation of effective schooling in a reformed and restructured education system depends on the capability of the leaders and the staff at the school level (Davies & Ellison, 1997:1). According to the Department of Education (2001d:9), evaluation should be conducted and then judgements and report must be made on the effectiveness of the following: the school's vision and mission statement, aims, policies and procedures; the leaderships at various levels in the staffing structure, for example, the principal and school management teams; the extent to which the staff and school community as a whole understand those intentions and carry them out; the extents to which the policies and procedures help the school attain its aims and improve. Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:36) are of the opinion that it is these aspects of school life that ensure that all other aspects are held together and developed.

2.3.3.3 Governance and relationships

An international trend in education reform is the devolution of decision-making powers from central level to the school level (Steyn, 2002a:251). As Squelch (1999:131) puts it, the movement towards decentralised school governance is a global phenomenon. According to Squelch (1999:128), this approach to governance assumes that decentralised decision-making authority is the key to improving schools and raising learners' performance levels. Thus, the school governing body should always work together with the principal, the educators and other stakeholders for the welfare of both the school and the learners. Mothata (2000:152) regards the school governing body as the official mouthpiece of the parents, the educators and the learners of the school on all matters other than those relating to the professional administration and management of the school. However, Squelch (1999:129) maintains that the degree to which authority is transferred to school governing bodies varies greatly in education systems.

The school governing body should act as a bridge between the school and the community. Thus, for the school governing body to avoid conflicts with other stakeholders and/or the clash of interest with these stakeholders members of the school governing body should know its functions and boundaries. According to Section 20 of the South African Schools Act (RSA, 1996:16), school governing bodies have to perform a number of functions. If a governing body does not perform its functions properly, the head of the department may withdraw it on reasonable grounds and provided that he/se follows correct procedures (Squelch, 1999:141). The supervisory teams (external evaluators) during the whole-school evaluation have to evaluate if these functions are being effectively performed. The key purpose is to assess the effectiveness of the governing body in giving the school clear strategic direction in line with the South African Schools Act (SASA), the National Education Policy Act (NEPA) and other related legislation (Department of Education, 2001d:9).

According to Squelch (1999:130), governance is considered to be a more effective means of improving standards of teaching and creating effective schools because it is more inclusive and seeks to meet the collective needs and aspirations of the community. Therefore, the supervisory team must make judgements and report on the effectiveness of the following: the constitution of the governing body and any terms of references; the organisation of the governing body and its committees; its membership; the part it plays in the formulation and implementation of the school's aims and policies; the suitability and effectiveness of the policies and systems it has for monitoring and evaluation the quality of education provided by the school.

2.3.3.4 Quality teaching and learning, and educator development

Quality does not simply refer to teaching and learning but is also linked to capacity, the appropriateness of the curriculum, the commitment of both the educator and the learner and the way standards are set and assessed (Van Wyk & Mothata, 1998:4). Botha and Hite (2000:133) add to this by describing quality in education as *inter alia*, the factors such as learners' achievements, teaching approaches and the nature (physical, cultural and social) of the school. This means that there is a need to infuse the system with the will and capacity to make continuous improvements at all levels (Van Wyk & Mothata, 1998:4). Thus, the first purpose is to evaluate the overall quality of teaching throughout the school and how well it helps all learners to learn and raise their levels of performance and attainment. The second is to judge the quality of in-service professional

development enjoyed by educators as highlighted by reports and the professional growth plans of the developmental appraisal system and other related initiatives (Department of Education, 2001d:9).

Lemmer (1998:122) maintains that there is a controversy regarding the validity of measurements of quality. Lemmer argues that one set of criteria or standards to measure quality formulated by one stakeholder may not suit the needs of another. Davies and Ellison (1995:5) regard clients' (parents, learners and educators) satisfaction as an indicator of quality or school effectiveness. As Lemmer (1998:127) puts it, quality is an issue that cannot be avoided in education. Thus, during the external evaluation supervisors must make judgements and report on the effectiveness of the following: educators' planning and schemes of work/work programmes; educators' expectations of the learners; the educator's subject/learning area/programme knowledge; the teaching strategies the educators use; the educators use of resources; the way educators control and manage the learners et cetera (Department of Education, 2001d:9-10). If all learners are to realise their potential, then their schools must also realise their potential (Stoll, 1999:504).

Hargreaves and Fullan (1992:ix) contend that the restructuring of schools, the composition of National and Provincial curricula, the development of benchmark assessments – all these things are of little value if they do not take the educator into account. Steyn (2002b:250) concurs and maintains that focusing on the people in the organisation (the school) is the key to quality and meaningful improvement in schools and organisations. The dividends yielded include a more effective school and, therefore, improved learner achievement, greater satisfaction and higher morale. Therefore, for the school to develop, educator development should become a priority. Steyn (2002b:250) is of the opinion that schools and other organisations that fail to provide opportunities for professional development jeopardise their ability to meet organisational goals. During whole-school evaluation supervisors have to establish whether the school has programmes for staff development and how effective these programmes are.

2.3.3.5 Curriculum provision and resources

The purpose is to evaluate the quality of the curriculum and how closely it matches the needs of the learners and any national or local requirements. A judgement has also to be made on the range and quality of other activities that enhance the curriculum (Department of Education, 2001d:10). Van

der Horst and McDonald (2003:146) maintain that curriculum documents are generally written in broad terms and, therefore, do not cater directly for the specific needs of individual schools. Consequently, educators need to translate curriculum guidelines into specific teaching programmes of sufficient detail to guide day-to-day activities. Educators always rely on the school management teams for guidance and support. The school management teams, particularly the Heads of Departments and the senior educators should ensure that they provide educators with all the necessary information and the required resources.

Naicker and Waddy (2003a:3) contend that to implement the curriculum and realise the vision of quality education effectively, the school management teams must have a very good understanding and insight into the curriculum policy documents. Without such understanding, the school management teams cannot guide and support educators to implement the curriculum. Therefore, during the external evaluation (whole-school evaluation) the supervisory team must make judgements and report on the effectiveness of the following: the balance between the National and Local curriculum; the structure of the curriculum; the planning process; how suitable the curriculum is for learners of different ages and different abilities; the school assessment policies and practices and their relevance to the curriculum and the provision for extra-curricular activities (Department of Education, 2001d:10). Naicker and Waddy (2003a:6) concur and maintain that the implementation of curriculum is the core business of the school. Therefore, it should be determined what is happening inside and outside the classroom in order to assist where necessary.

2.3.3.6 Learner achievement

The main purpose of external evaluators is to evaluate the achievement of the learners and assess the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values that learners have acquired. Particular attention must be paid to levels of performance in communication skills, problem solving skills and the ability to work in groups and to make responsible decisions (Department of Education, 2001d:10). Van der Horst and McDonald (2003:3) concur and maintain that through education learners can be equipped with such knowledge, skills, attitudes and values which can help to make them active and valuable participants in creating a better country and to create a better future for all.

According to Killen (1999:12), educators must provide learners with sufficient opportunities to practice using the new knowledge and skills that they gain so that under the educator’s guidance

they can explore and experiment with their learning, correct errors and adjust their thinking. Thus, it is essential for learners to be helped to apply their new knowledge and skills rather than just accumulate new knowledge and skills. According to the Department of Education (2001d:10), supervisors must, therefore, among the other things, make judgements and report on the effectiveness of the following: learners' achievements in reading, speaking and writing in the language of teaching and learning and one other additional language; learners' standards in numeracy and in all other subjects/learning areas/programmes and the progress made by learners in light of their known prior achievements. As Killen (1999:23) puts it, teaching is only teaching if learners learn. Therefore, educators should make a great effort to ensure that learners do not only see the need for learning but also become actively involved in the learning process. Stoll (1999:505) is of the opinion that learning outcomes are important but without attention to the learning process they cannot be achieved.

Educators, therefore, have the responsibility to teach learners to think critically and to solve problems in their specific learning areas (Van der Horst & McDonald, 2003:220). Blandford (2003:264-265) maintains that paying attention to learners' perceptions and intentions can help to enhance the quality of learners' learning and achievements. Thus, Killen (1999:20) contends that no matter how an education system is organised, some people will always want to make comparisons between the achievements of learners. Whilst it is often not possible to avoid situations like these, it is important to avoid making unfair comparisons. As a result Killen (1999:20) is of the opinion that fair inferences can only be drawn from assessment results, and valid comparisons if assessment data include information on the nature of the learners, the learners' opportunity to learn the material assessed, the adequacy of resources available to the learners and the methods of assessment.

2.3.3.7 School safety, security and discipline

A school should be a place where learners can concentrate on their studies without being concerned about issues of discipline, safety and security (Naicker & Waddy, 2003b:5). This is not always the case, as a number of schools have to deal with disciplinary issues all the time. Both the educators and the learners live in fear of being attacked/assaulted or being injured. As Bissetty (1998:1) contends, frustrated school principals in South Africa have spoken out on the alarming increase in crime by armed learners and these principals have warned that lenient education policies are seriously hampering the enforcement of discipline.

Likewise, Naicker and Waddy (2003b:8) maintain that in South African schools issues that have to do with discipline, safety and security have become of increased concern following incidents of robbery, assault, drug dealing and even murder on school premises. Discipline has become a real problem in many schools worldwide. Christine (2004:11) agrees, adding that learners steal, smoke and drink, behave in age-inappropriate ways sexually, bully other learners, are disruptive in lesson time and form gangs in schools knowing full well that they are untouchable. Van Wyk (1999b:89) concurs that the issue is not the degree of school crime but rather the impact it has on the quality of learners' education. Learners are missing school because they fear for their personal safety.

Therefore, the external evaluators should evaluate school safety, security and discipline measures that are being implemented in the school. According to the Department of Education (2001d:11), one purpose is to evaluate the extent to which the school knows about legislation which concerns learners' rights and the effectiveness with which it implements it. Another is to ensure that the school is secure and the learners are safe. The third purpose is to evaluate the effectiveness of the school's disciplinary procedures. Van Wyk (1999b:89) contends that quality education diminishes in a climate of violence and fear. Therefore, supervisors must make judgements and report on the effectiveness of the following: the school's procedures for safety, security and discipline and their implementation; safety regulations in laboratories and workshops and other areas of the school; emergency procedures and how well they are known by learners and staff; the provision for any boarders; the support and care for learners and the school's disciplinary procedures (Department of Education, 2001d:11).

2.3.3.8 School infrastructure

The years of turmoil have taken a heavy toll on the infrastructure of the education and training system. In predominantly black townships, for example, most schools have been vandalised (Van Wyk & Mothata, 1998:5). Therefore, external evaluators have to assess the conditions of schools and resources in various schools. Thus, particular attention must be paid to their schools' state of repair and how well these are organised and used in the interests of the learners (Department of Education, 2001d:11).

According to the Department of Education (2001d:11), supervisors must, therefore, make judgements and report on the effectiveness of the following: the sufficiency of suitably qualified

and experienced educators and support staff; the amount of accommodation and its state of repair and suitability of the school's premises; the sufficiency and suitability of books and equipment for learning; the efficiency with which all the school's resources are used and the methods by which all the school and the school governing body ensure that they get value for money. Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:128) are of the opinion that not only do these resources need to be available to the school but they also need to be appropriate to the school in terms of its vision and aims. For example, a school that has committed itself to inclusion of learners with disabilities must ensure that the building accommodates their particular needs.

2.3.3.9 Parents and community

Schools are under increasing pressure to develop strategies for securing greater parent involvement (Squelch & Lemmer, 1994:91). Pretorius (1999:158-159) concurs that an important aspect emphasised in global reform is that schools alone cannot resolve the supposed failures of the education system but that it is the shared responsibility of communities. Thus, co-operation, a joint effort from parents, educators and other community structures is what is required. As a result it should be determined during the external evaluation as to whether parents and community are involved in the school activities and what role/s these individuals play to ensure that there is quality education in the school. As Squelch and Lemmer (1994:92) put it, the time when parents' only link with the school was to attend the annual parents' evening is over, not only because family life has changed but also because schools need and require parents' support.

The Department of Education (2001d:11-12) lists the following as the purposes of evaluating this area (parents and community): to gauge the extent to which the school encourages parental and community involvement in the education of the learners and how it makes use of their contributions; to estimate the value to learners' education of the exchange of information between parents and school about them; to ascertain the response of parents and to evaluate the links between the community and the school. Lemmer (2000:68) contends that schools must become places where families feel wanted and recognised for their strengths and potential. This is not often the case and the schools do not always welcome parents.

According to the Department of Education (2001d:12), the supervisory team must make judgements and report on the following:

- The school's communication with parents and the way the school responds to the complaints and suggestion that come from the parents;
- The system for reporting to parents about the progress their children are making and the standards they are reaching;
- The contribution that parents make to the school and to learners' education through any committees or support for the school's resources;
- The school's guidance for parents to help them in their understanding of the work their children are doing;
- The school's involvement with the local community and how this affects learner's educational experience and curricular activity;
- The methods the school uses to educate learners in the use of the local environment;
- The range of joint activities undertaken by the school and community in the interests of the learners.

This shows that effective education requires close co-operation between educators and parents/community (Squelch & Lemmer, 1994:92). This co-operation can, to a larger extent, help the school to understand the learner better as the school knows the background of the learner as well as that of the parent/s. A learner that knows that educators know his/her parent/s is more likely to behave appropriately as he/she knows that the school is in close contact with the parent/s. Thus, schools should become more open to parents and should regard them as partners in educating the learner. But Lemmer (2000:64) warns that good school, family and community partnerships cannot just lead to improved academic learner achievement, self-esteem, school attendance and social behaviour. Rather, partnership activities should be designed to engage, guide and motivate learners to produce their own successes.

Naicker and Waddy (2002:17) regard the above key areas as of major importance as they ensure that the evaluation covers all aspects of the school. These aspects are examined during both the school's self-evaluation and the external evaluation. But if there is a need any other additional area for evaluation can be included.

2.3.4 Evaluation process in whole-school evaluation

Whole-school evaluation is a process and this process should be understood by all role-players for its effective implementation. According to the National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation (RSA, 2001:16), the whole-school evaluation cycle includes pre-evaluation surveys/visits, school self-evaluation, post-evaluation reporting and post-evaluation support. All steps in the process should be observed and followed correctly in order to achieve the intended goals of evaluation.
Naicker and Waddy (2002:8) list the following important steps in the process:

- Selection: schools are notified if they have been selected, they are visited and the relevant documents are given to them. The Department of Education (2001d:3) maintains that the number of schools to be evaluated is decided at National level against agreed criteria. Naicker and Waddy (2002:11) regard the following as the criteria on which the selection of schools should be based on: the location of the school (rural or urban), the size of the school (big or small) and gender (co-educational/single sex).
- Briefing: stakeholders at these schools are given a through review of the process. Once schools have been selected, the Provinces inform the schools and arrange the date for the evaluation (Department of Education, 2001d:3). During this stage schools are fully briefed about the process of evaluation and procedures to be followed.
- Self-evaluation: schools undertake this process (they use a standard evaluation instrument). According to Relic (s.a.:5), a self-evaluation instrument establishes a number of key performance areas and provides a set of indicators to evaluate these. It can be used to assess all the key areas to provide a broad overview of the quality of a school or to focus on a few specific areas only. Thus, schools should take a closer look at them and assess their practices and outcomes.
- External evaluation: external teams spend three or five days at each school. According to Department of Education (2000b:3), this will depend on how effective the school is. Effective schools may not require five-day evaluations. During this stage the supervisors use three main techniques for collecting evidence about the school's work. These are: scrutiny of other relevant school documentation, district records, developmental plans and appraisal systems; discussion with personnel associated with the school and observation of the school's work, especially lesson observation.

- Report: external teams produce detailed reports of their findings and they make recommendations for the improvement of the schools. According to the Department of Education (2001d:6), the findings of reports should naturally lead to district, provincial and National improvement plans that address areas needing improvements, within specified time frames. The findings also form the basis for future evaluations of the school's work and also serve as an important tool for self-evaluation.
- School improvement plan (SIP): external teams assist the schools in drawing up these plans. The Ministry of Education (2003:4) maintains that the school improvement plan must be realistic and manageable by the staff responsible for implementation. It is, therefore, essential that the school improvement plan should reflect both the needs of the school as well as the individual staff members and the resources available to the school.
- Support for improvement: the officials assist schools in carrying out these plans. The Department of Education (2001b:10) maintains that the district support teams or professional support services must assist schools to implement the recommendations of the evaluation report. The district must ensure appropriate provision for updating the supervisory unit, support services and schools under its jurisdiction in matters concerned with whole-school evaluation and improvement.

After the above steps have been undertaken and completed, effective and ineffective (good and under-performing) schools can be identified. Once identified, under-performing schools will receive advice and support in their continual efforts to improve their effectiveness (RSA, 2001:8).

2.3.4.1 Distinction between internal and external evaluations

Evaluation (whole-school evaluation) takes place in two phases, namely, internal evaluation where the school conducts its own evaluation (self-evaluation) and external evaluation where the evaluation is conducted by the outside evaluators. Both evaluations are important for the improvement and development of the school. Nevo (1995:2) maintains that internal evaluation has an advantage over external evaluation for the purpose of formative evaluation but not for the purpose of summative evaluation. Since formative evaluation and summative evaluation are both legitimate functions of school evaluation, a combination of both internal and external evaluations is required in developing a sound system for school evaluation. Thus, whole-school evaluation

encapsulates school self-evaluation as well as external evaluation (Department of Education, 2001d:3).

For Nevo (1995:2) the reason for the need to combine internal and external evaluations is related to the special characteristics of these two kinds of evaluations. Internal evaluation tends to be more subjective and biased, while external evaluation is often perceived as a threat to the school and stimulates defensive behaviour of educators and principals. Thus, to safeguard the limitations of each evaluation whole-school evaluation that focuses on both internal evaluation and external evaluation should be conducted. As Nevo (1995:2) suggests rather than getting a biased perspective from reliance only on internal evaluation or stimulating a discourse of accusations and apologies by external evaluation, a more constructive evaluation discourse could be obtained by combining the two (internal and external evaluations).

The principal or an educator delegated by the principal conducts internal evaluation but this educator should always report to the principal. Meanwhile, the supervisory team (departmental officials) conducts external evaluation. The team then reports its findings and recommendations to the school as well as to the Department of Education at the Provincial level. Nevo (1995:48) contends that the objectivity and credibility of the internal evaluator may be lower than those of external evaluators who are not directly employed by the school and/or enjoys a higher degree of independence. However, Cullingford (1997:120) warns that external evaluators should not force changes against the will of the school community, as such changes result in no improvement, taking place. Therefore, the school community should not only understand the reasons for the change but should also be part of the process from the onset. Thus, internal evaluation and external evaluation should complement each other. Likewise, if a school is evaluated internally and externally, the evaluation can turn into a dialogue for school improvement rather than external accusations (Nevo, 1995:168). Thus, both sides then use evaluation to find solutions to different problems and answer questions for which there might be more than one correct answer. Thus, there is a clear need for both internal and external evaluations in order to confirm an institution's quality assurance and review procedures (Earley, 1998:169-170).

2.4 APPROACHES TO EVALUATION IN SOUTH AFRICAN SCHOOLS

There are different approaches to evaluation which aim at the improvement of the individuals as well as that of the school. But in South Africa the following approaches have been adopted: developmental appraisal system, whole-school evaluation, and systemic evaluation. Although they all take different forms (approaches), they all intend to ensure that there is quality education (teaching and learning) in the school. None of these approaches interfere with the activities of each other but instead complement each other. As the National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation (RSA, 2001:9) puts it, part of the purpose of whole-school evaluation is to evaluate the effectiveness with which systemic evaluation and developmental appraisal system are being implemented and to provide information aimed at strengthening their contribution to educational improvement.

According to Naicker and Waddy (2002:4), schools should use the results of these evaluations (whole-school evaluation, systemic evaluation and developmental appraisal system) as they develop school improvement programmes. Blandford (2000:142) argues that school improvement will not happen without professional development for both the individual and the institution (the school). Thus, different approaches of evaluation should be conducted in order to identify the strengths and limitations of the individuals and those that of the school. For each approach to be successful, all role-players should have a clear understanding of what it is, how to strive for it, why it has emerged as an important feature in education and how it is audited and evaluated. As Puri (1996:116) puts it, no system can be effectively implemented unless the people responsible for the system implementation are totally aware of the requirements of the system.

2.4.1 Developmental appraisal system

The developmental appraisal system (DAS) is based on the premise of life-long learning and the principle that the school is a learning organisation (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:4). According to Steyn (2002b:300), the manual for developmental appraisal regards the aim of developmental appraisal as facilitating the personal and professional development of all educators in order to improve the quality of teaching and learning. In order to achieve this aim the following requirements must be met: a democratic organisational climate, a culture of learning in institutions and a commitment of educators to development. South African Democratic Teacher's Union (SADTU) (2002:1) contends

that the developmental appraisal system is meant to address the need for educator development and training as well as assessments of educator quality that can be measured against the investments (inputs) made by the education department. It is crucial that every staff member should be involved in the developmental appraisal process from the onset so that he/she owns the system. Jantjes (1996:50) is of the opinion that educators were opposed to traditional evaluation procedures not because they wanted to be left alone but because they were asking for evaluative procedures that are enabling, allow self-reflection, form an integral part of teaching and, above all, procedures with which they can identify. As a result the developmental appraisal system was introduced after long deliberations between various stakeholders (the Department of Education officials and the educator unions).

Patel (2001:1) regards the developmental appraisal system as a system that allows the classroom practitioners (educators) to identify their own development needs through a democratic and formative process together with the participation of education managers (principals), peers and experts. But not only educators in the classroom are subjected to this system. Naicker and Waddy (2002:60) maintain that office-based educators like directors, district managers, superintendents of education (management), superintendents of education (advisory), principals, deputy principals and heads of department should be also appraised. However, different criteria should be used when appraising these personnel. These individuals do different tasks; therefore, they should be appraised in terms of their competence at those tasks. The success of the developmental appraisal system depends on three important things, namely, the involvement of the stakeholders (appraisers and appraisees), their understanding of the process and the availability of resources.

Naicker and Waddy (2002:63-64) regard democracy, transparency and development as the three philosophies that inform the guiding principles of appraisal in the South African context. For example, the developmental appraisal system is designed to ensure that there is democratic participation in the appraisal process. Thus, the establishment of an appraisal panel is intended to achieve this, as the panel includes all stakeholders including the appraisee and it is a collaborative or joint effort. Meanwhile, transparency ensures both democracy and accountability. It also prevents appraisals from being done in secretive and corrupt ways. Also, the appraisal is in essence a developmental process and it is not meant to intimidate and victimise educators. It is intended to enrich strengths, develop potential and overcome weaknesses.

2.4.2 Whole-school evaluation

Whole-school evaluation is regarded as a system of evaluating schools in South Africa that aims to ensure that the maintenance and improvement of standards both in individual schools and in the education system as a whole (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:8). According to the Department of Education (2000b:5), the school as a whole is responsible for the education of its learners, within the framework of the policies set by the government. Therefore, in South African schools this initiative (whole-school evaluation) looks at what is happening in the school as a whole.

The Department of Education (2000b:5) regards this approach (whole-school evaluation) as a joint collaboration between schools, districts and supervisory units making judgements about the school looking at both inputs and outcomes. As a result all individuals have an important role to play in order for the school to improve. For example, schools are expected to conduct self-evaluation prior to the external evaluation and this enables the schools to make all the necessary preparations before being visited by the supervisory teams for the external evaluations. Naicker and Waddy (2002:28) regard the purpose of self-evaluation as enabling the school to reflect on its performance with regard to its aims and priorities; measure its performance against local needs and national standards; establish strategies for monitoring and evaluating its work and prepare for external evaluation.

The South African whole-school evaluation is conducted according to guidelines and criteria that are being set by the Ministry of Education (discussed in the previous sections). These guidelines provide guidance on how supervisors should carry out their responsibilities and which school activities they should report on. The emphasis throughout is on supervisors using a range of data and indicators to reach evaluative conclusions based on evidence, rather than simply to provide descriptions of what happens in the schools (Department of Education, 2001b:3). Supervisory units also have to use instruments set by the National Ministry when conducting their evaluations (external evaluations). The Department of Education (2001b:2) contends that it is important that parents also understand the application of whole-school evaluation instrument since it (whole-school evaluation instrument) affects the quality of education their children receive. Since whole-school evaluation followed in South Africa is transparent, everyone knows what is expected of him/her.

Schools are evaluated comprehensively. Thus, numerous areas are looked at so that multiple sources of information are tapped. This means that valid and reliable judgements can be provided both to the schools and to departmental decision-makers (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:9). The focus of whole-school evaluation in South African schools is on both internal monitoring and external evaluation that is self-evaluation by the school and external evaluation by the supervisory units and the monitoring and support provided by the district-based support teams (RSA, 2001:9).

2.4.3 Systemic evaluation

Systemic evaluation studies offer a powerful lens through which to view the performance and health of the education system (Mpumalanga Department of Education, s.a.:viii). Systemic evaluation is an approach by which a system of education is evaluated. The objective is holistic assessment of the effectiveness of an entire system and the extent to which the vision and goals of the system are being achieved (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:9). This evaluation refers to evaluations that are conducted at key transitional stages of the education system, namely, grade three (foundation phase), grade six (intermediate phase) and grade nine (senior phase). These phases can be regarded as the key or exit points in the education system, as they take the learner to the next level or phase. Naicker and Waddy (2002:39) regard systemic evaluation as one of the initiatives aimed at obtaining reliable information, monitoring quality and standards of performance and ensuring development in the education system. But specifically, systemic evaluation aims to: inform (policy formulation, revision of programmes and intervention programmes); monitor and sustain performance; promote and ensure accountability; gain public confidence in the education system and benchmark the performance of the system nationally and internationally (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:39).

Systemic evaluation provides monitoring and evaluating activities that help to determine the quality and standards of performance of the system as a whole. Systemic reform is based on a theory that assumes the highest level of education will be achieved if all of the pieces and components within a system are aligned and working in cooperation toward important common goals. One role of systemic evaluation is to verify this theory as applied to the system (Webb, 1997:2). This approach, therefore, looks to effectiveness of the entire education system. As the Department of Education (2001c:42) suggests, the systemic evaluation approach needs to be holistic by taking into consideration gender issues, inclusivity, human rights, adult basic education and training (ABET), early childhood development (ECD) and the way these address barriers to learning and

development at school, circuit, district, provincial and National levels. Naicker and Waddy (2002:39) maintain that systemic evaluation activities should give useful feedback to the schools that are involved in the exercises but the focus should not be on the performance of the individual schools. The Department of Education (2001c:10) maintain that systemic evaluation should answer the question: how well and to what extent do learners master the basic skills, especially in the areas of literacy, numeracy and life skills, and what are the factors influencing the acquisition of these skills. According to Mpumalanga Department of Education (s.a.:1), the foundation of Systemic Evaluation lies in using learner performance as the point of reference against which the rest of the education system is evaluated. The interest in learner achievement or performance assessment coincides with major reforms of learning goals and content standards, curriculum, instruction, the qualifications of educators, and the relationships among parents, communities, schools, government, and business. Therefore, the range of factors that can influence learner achievement and performance is wide.

Systemic evaluation studies describe prevailing conditions within the system being evaluated as well as the relationships between various conditions and factors operating within the system. Knowledge of these relationships is essential for the understanding of the complex dynamics of the education system and for implementing specific strategies and policies to attain desired outcomes (Mpumalanga Department of Education s.a.:84). Webb (1997:2) is of the opinion that much still needs to be learned about systemic evaluation and measuring change in large education systems.

According to Webb (1997:2-4), the following are a few areas that need attention:

- *Equity*. Assessing equity in learner learning throughout the system is a critical concern and raises important questions for systemic evaluations. More attention needs to be given toward developing ways for measuring a system's progress in achieving equity in learner learning.
- *Achievement measures*. Assessment technology is insufficient to measure all-important knowledge of science and mathematics. Valid techniques to apply on a large scale still need to be developed to measure how learners are able to reason, to solve complex problems, to build arguments, and do scientific inquiry. *Habits of mind*, meta-cognition, and dispositions are important qualities for pursuing science and mathematics, but are very difficult to measure.
- *System saturation*. Systemic evaluation, like systemic reform, must keep the entire education system within its view at all times. The most common approach to evaluating systemic

initiatives was to study the components and parts of the system. Less is known about how to consider the interaction among components, their linkages, and what are magnifying effects. More still needs to be learned about tracking through a system change attributable to the systemic initiative.

- *Time frame*. It is unclear how much time must be allowed before various changes in an education system should become observable and sustainable. In judging the value of systemic reform, systemic evaluation must attend to the institutionalisation of structures and functions that will sustain movement toward positive outcomes. Evaluation is frequently called upon to produce information and judgements before sufficient time has transpired and enough effort has been expended to fully reach goals. More needs to be understood about how to identify and measure interim attainments and progress. There is also need to understand more about what is a reasonable amount of time for a system to make significant changes.

2.5 THE LINK BETWEEN WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM

In recent years many schools have experimented with a number of different methods of evaluating quality, with more or less positive experiences (Relic, sa:1). Nevo (1995:29) contends that useful evaluations are not one-shot activities but rather on-going endeavours. To ensure that there is quality teaching and learning within the school, evaluation of both the individual staff member and that of the school as a whole should be undertaken at constant intervals. As Quinlan and Davidoff (1997:11) put it, classroom practice and experience are inextricably linked with the school as a whole.

Naicker and Waddy (2002:64) regard the developmental appraisal system which focuses on the individual educator, as part of the wider educational changes that are framed within a whole-school evaluation approach that works with the institution as a whole and targets all elements of the school to bring about meaningful and sustainable change. Likewise, Blandford (2000:143) regards the appraisal process as the mechanism that enables educators and principals to relate individual targets to school targets. Therefore, both the individual educator and the school as a whole should be constantly evaluated in order to check if these meet their needs and goals as well as those of the entire school community. According to Goddard and Emerson (1992:21), the successful school is the one where individual educators are motivated; where the disparate talents of the various

members of staff are harnessed; and where all efforts are co-ordinated so that the school's objectives are fulfilled. Appraisal provides a process which can foster this integration of individual educators with the school as a whole.

Developmental appraisal system is part of whole-school evaluation approach and should be viewed in relation to other initiatives that aim to make schools centres for effective teaching and learning (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:64). Lytle (2002:166) maintains that no programme has all the answers for school improvement and each programme requires supplemental elements. Meanwhile, Cullingford (1997:119) argues that successful reform focuses on the school as a whole rather than one particular factor such as the curriculum or educator development. This does not, however, imply that the latter is unimportant. Without educator development there can be no school improvement. As Fullan in Du Four and Berkey (1995:2) puts it, it is only when enough people within an organisation (the school) change that the organisation can be transformed.

According to Naicker and Waddy (2002:64), in relation to the whole-school evaluation approach, developmental appraisal system provides a useful way in which schools and the Department of Education, South Africa can determine the actual needs of educators. Educators whose needs are addressed or attended to are more likely to be motivated and work effectively and efficiently. This can help the school to achieve its goals and objectives. Although the central concern is with the personal and development of educators, appraisal has a vital role to play in the overall development of the institution (Jones, 1993:8). Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:149) concur that appraisal is a central developmental process in the school. Therefore, developmental appraisal system should be seen as a pre-requisite of whole-school evaluation. Whole-school evaluation focuses on everything taking place in the school environment including the needs of the staff that are covered in the developmental appraisal system.

Because developmental appraisal system is formative and developmental, it can identify areas where educators need support. This makes the planning of relevant interventions, which complement other interventions that are designed to improve the whole school, possible (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:64). Blandford (2000:143) concurs and maintains that the function of appraisal within a learning organisation is to provide information on the individual and institution requirements, which, when met, can promote organisation-wide development. Thus, developmental appraisal system facilitates overall educational improvement (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:64). While

developmental appraisal system is conducted in order to address the needs of the individuals, whole-school evaluation is conducted in order to address the needs of the school as a whole including those of the individuals in the school. Consequently, Quinlan and Davidoff (1997:14) are of the opinion that out of the whole-school evaluation, certain staff development needs can be identified. These include the personal needs of educators or the organisational needs of the school.

2.5.1 Aligning whole-school evaluation with developmental appraisal system

According to the National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation (RSA, 2001:7), whole-school evaluation should be aligned with developmental appraisal system so that educators are confident that the features of good practice sought in whole-school school evaluation are the same as those encouraged through appraisal and development programmes. This acts as a motivational factor, as educators realise that their evaluation is for the development of the school. Therefore, developmental appraisal system should be part of the school life and should be linked to school's other routines and developmental activities (Jones, 1993:10). These activities are evaluated during the whole-school evaluation.

Both the developmental appraisal system and whole-school evaluation are underpinned by a process that must be supportive and developmental rather than punitive and judgemental (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:65). For whole-school evaluation and developmental appraisal system to be effective and efficient, they should be well managed and well conducted. Effective and efficient whole-school evaluation and developmental appraisal system can help in building and maintaining an effective school.

Both whole-school evaluation and developmental appraisal system identify areas for development. But part of the purpose of whole-school evaluation is to evaluate the effectiveness with which the initiatives of developmental appraisal system are implemented (RSA, 2001:9). However, Quinlan and Davidoff (1997:11-12) contend that to appraise educators without understanding the context in which they are working may lead to inaccurate judgements. Thus, all aspects of school life that intersect with the classroom should be evaluated. From the school's point of view, appraisal can form a very valuable strand in its own self-evaluation (Goddard & Emerson, 1992:22). The developmental appraisal system if properly done can help not only the educators to identify their strengths and weaknesses but also the school. As Goddard and Emerson (1992:22) put it, properly

used, the information arising from appraisal can provide invaluable feedback and can assist the school to unite and move forward positively.

2.5.2 Integrated Quality Management System as a form of aligning the different quality management programmes

South Africa has adopted an Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) as a form of aligning the different quality management programmes in order to ensure that there is quality education in schools. As Naicker and Waddy (2002:7) put it, good schools are constantly aware of the need to evaluate standards, so IQMS is the means to do so effectively. However, for IQMS to be effectively implemented, it is important that all stakeholders should not only know these programmes but that they should also understand their implications to stakeholders and the processes involved in these programmes. Each individual should also be clear about the role that he/she should play during the process.

According to Education Labour Relation Council (2003:7), there are three programmes that need to be in place in order to enhance and monitor performance of the education system. These are: developmental appraisal, performance measurement and whole-school evaluation. Each of these programmes has a distinct focus and purpose and, therefore, there should be no contradiction between any of them. For example, the purpose of developmental appraisal is to appraise individual educators in a transparent manner with a view to determining areas of strength and weaknesses and to draw up programmes for individual development. Meanwhile, the purpose of performance measurement is to evaluate individual educators for salary progression, grade progression, affirmation of appointments and rewards and incentives. Furthermore, the purpose of whole-school evaluation is to evaluate the overall effectiveness of a school, including the support provided by the district, school management, infrastructure and learning resources, as well as the quality of teaching and learning (Education Labour Relation Council, 2003:7). It is important that the purpose of these programmes should be clearly communicated to all stakeholders so that they should support these programmes.

These quality management programmes should be planned and aligned in a coherent way. The Education Labour Relation Council (2003:8) lists the following as the main purposes of aligning these programmes: to enable the different quality management system programmes to inform and

strengthen one another; to define the relationship among the different programmes of an Integrated Quality Management System; to avoid unnecessary duplication in order to optimise the use of human resources; to assure that there is ongoing support and improvement and to advocate accountability. Stakeholders should also understand the importance of aligning these programmes. According to Education Labour Relation Council (2003:8-9), the following are some of the features of the IQMS:

- Developmental appraisal and performance measurement inform and strengthen one another without duplication of structures and procedures.
- Performance measurement and developmental appraisal must be linked to an annual cycle that must be completed within a calendar year (a period when the staff at a school is likely to be most stable).
- Developmental appraisal and performance measurement inform and strengthen internal whole-school evaluation. But the separate purposes of these programmes remain intact.

Puri (1996:10) argues that although any approach can provide suitable quality system framework, success can be determined by the organisation's ability to manage and control the system effectively. Goddard and Emerson (1992:36) maintain that the school's targets each year should be linked with appraisal so that targets for professional development arising from educators' appraisal can be related to the targets and priorities in the school development plan. Appraisal targets when taken together should provide an important agenda for whole-school action.

2.6 THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE MAJOR ROLE-PLAYERS IN WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION

Whole-school evaluation, like all other government's initiatives can only succeed if all role-players understand their roles (tasks) and perform these roles effectively. According to Naicker and Waddy (2002:15), there is a chain of responsibility that runs from the National Ministry to individual schools. Christie (1999:285) regards this as one of the major difficulties of state-led reform initiatives as education system operates through many levels. Policies formulated at National and provincial levels pass through education bureaucracies to the complex contexts of schools. The problem is compounded by the fact that in most cases the uniqueness of the individual schools and the contexts in which these schools operate are often not taken into account. As Sack (2002:6) puts

it, most of the problems come when districts (bureaucrats) try to install one-size-fits all programmes. Christie (1999:285) maintains that sustaining a reform thrust through these levels is often impossible.

Therefore, there should be a clear guidance and management from the National and Provincial levels so that the implementation of whole-school evaluation would be effectively monitored at district and school levels. As Christie (1999:290) suggests, it should not be assumed that national policies can achieve classroom-level changes, there should be specific strategies and/or engagement with actual schools. Thus, the National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation makes clear the links between those at National and Provincial levels who are responsible for the quality education, and supervisors, schools and local support services (RSA, 2001:7).

2.6.1 The role of the National Ministry in whole-school evaluation

According to the National Education Policy Act (RSA, 1996b:4), the National Ministry may determine national education policy in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution and this Act. For example, the National Minister of Education may determine national policy for the planning, provision, financing, staffing, co-ordination, management, governance, programmes, monitoring, evaluation and well being of the education system. Whole-school evaluation is one of the policies in which the National Ministry should play an important role in order for it to be implemented effectively. Although implementation takes place at the school level, the National Ministry should ensure that conditions are favourable for schools to implement it.

According to the National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation (RSA, 2001:17-18), for whole-school evaluation to take place successfully the National Ministry must provide, within its annual education budget, funding that should be distributed to all the Provinces as a conditional grant specifically for school evaluation activities and for supporting schools in their effort to implement the recommendations of the evaluation report. This can be of great help to particularly those schools that are not financially strong. The Ministry must set up an appropriate national body to oversee the development, administration and periodic review of the National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation, such as policy, guidelines and instruments, in response to changing circumstances. And also be responsible for developing and implementing a policy for evaluating provincial and district performance in contribution to the implementation of the whole-school evaluation policy and the

support they give to improving performance in schools (RSA, 2001:17). The Ministry, thus, oversees that all levels perform their responsibilities so that whole-school evaluation becomes successful.

The National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation (RSA, 2001:17) maintains that the Ministry should also ensure that the evaluation is administered effectively by providing guidance and support to Provinces on how the evaluation should be organised and conducted. This implies that the National Ministry should empower the Provinces as well as the district to enable them not only to supervise the implementation of whole-school evaluation but also to provide assistance to schools whenever necessary. It is also the responsibility of the National Ministry to decide on the national sample of schools to be evaluated and to determine the length of evaluation cycle. Once the sample has been decided, the National Ministry should inform the Provinces of the number and sample of schools to be evaluated (RSA, 2001:17).

Although the evaluation (external evaluation) is conducted by supervisors from the Province, it is the responsibility of the National Ministry to oversee the training, accreditation and registration of all supervisors. The Ministry should also create systems for monitoring the quality of whole-school evaluations and the work of the supervisors (SRA, 2001:17). Thus, the National Ministry is actively involved in the whole process of whole-school evaluation as it interacts with the Provinces all the times to ensure that everyone not only understands whole-school evaluation but is also able to implement it effectively. Thus, the National Ministry should not only monitor the implementation of whole-school evaluation but should also actively support the Provinces in ensuring that whole-school evaluation indeed takes place at the school level.

The National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation (RSA, 2001:17) also maintains that the Ministry should collect certain raw data gathered through school evaluations from the Provinces in order to enable the Minister to construct an annual report. This data may be used to guide the formulation and review of education policy. Naicker and Waddy (2000:25) maintain that the report on the results of evaluation is not confidential. Thus, a summary of the report must be made available to those who may request it. This is in line with one of the purposes of whole-school evaluation, namely to keep stakeholders and society at large always informed about the performance of schools. Thus, the National Ministry should maintain an accessible national database on the findings from whole-school evaluation monitoring and evaluation that can be used to refine indicators and provide

benchmark data (RSA, 2001:17-18). Benchmark data enable schools to compare their performance to the performance of schools having similar population characteristics to their own (Griffiths, 1998:8).

2.6.2 The role of the Provinces in whole-school evaluation

The role of the Provinces is crucial in ensuring that whole-school evaluation takes place effectively in schools. The Provinces act as links between the National Ministry and the districts and/or the schools. According to Chisholm (2000:82-83), the Provinces have two main roles and functions. First, Provinces are supposed to inform national policy development through relevant contributions to policy development processes. Second, Provinces are responsible for successful implementation of policy, norms and standards. Thus, the key role of the Provinces is to take the responsibility for all aspects of the implementation of whole-school evaluation.

Provinces create or must create an environment that is appropriate for effective whole-school evaluation to be implemented in schools. Naicker and Waddy (2002:17) maintain that the Province has a crucial role to play prior to the external evaluation as well as after the external evaluation.

2.6.2.1 The role of the Province prior to the external evaluation

Once the provincial supervisory unit (PSU) is informed by the National Ministry which schools will be evaluated, it (the Province) selects the supervisors who will be involved. It then informs the schools, sends the appropriate forms for completion and also a list of the documents the supervisors will need (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:17). The Province should ensure that all the relevant structures (supervisory teams, district support services and school principals) understand their roles in whole-school evaluation before the external evaluations are conducted. For example, the Province should ensure that district officials have work-shopped all school principals on whole-school evaluation processes before it is implemented.

Provinces have also to ensure that sufficient funds are available within their annual education budget to enable support services and schools to carry out developmental activities in accordance with the National Policy. Provinces have also to show that this responsibility is being carried out equitably by publishing how these funds are allocated and what criteria are used when distributing

funds to different schools (RSA, 2001:18). This shows that Provinces have an important role to play in order for whole-school evaluation to be effective in schools.

2.6.2.2 The role of the Province after the external evaluation

After the evaluation the Province processes the information gathered by the supervisory teams from various schools and submit that information to the National Ministry (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:17). The National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation (RSA, 2001:18) concurs and maintains that each Province must ensure that an appropriate provincial database is established. This database must be fully accessible, capable of providing information that can be used to enable it to benchmark its performance in comparison with other Provinces and linked to the Ministry's database on quality assurance. This information (data) is essential in order to strategise the improvement plans.

Most schools in South Africa have suffered from extreme shortages in terms of material and financial resources. This has deeply affected the life of schools and, in some cases, has made it almost impossible to pursue educational goals (Davidoff & Lazarus, 2002:127). Therefore, Provinces should provide a budget to help schools respond effectively to the recommendations made in an evaluation report and should also put in place contingency plans for dealing with schools that need urgent support. This includes providing appropriate in-service training programmes (RSA, 2001:18). Financial support from the Provinces is essential, particularly for the disadvantaged schools if these schools are to cope with the shortfalls that may be identified by the supervisory teams. As Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:31) suggest, it is important that efforts are made to ensure that these budget allocations are adequate to support effective teaching and learning in the schools.

Provinces should put in place policies and support services designed to provide appropriate administrative support, advice and guidance to help schools respond to the recommendations emanating from external evaluations (RSA, 2001:18). This implies that Provinces should constantly monitor the processes of whole-school evaluation at every level under their jurisdictions. If whole-school evaluation fails, Provinces should take the responsibility like all other levels.

2.6.3 The role of the supervisory team in whole-school evaluation

The supervisory team is responsible for the day-to-day operations of whole-school evaluation under the direction of the Head of the Provincial Department of Education but within a nationally co-ordinated framework. This is to ensure synergy and the integration of all activities associated with quality assurance (RSA, 2001:10). The supervisory team is the team that does the practical work as the team members visit the selected schools to conduct evaluations. Nevo (1995:48) contends that external evaluators (supervisory team members) enjoy a higher degree of independence, as the school does not directly employ them. Thus, these evaluations, to some extent, can be more objective and credible.

Drake and Roe (1999:291) are of the opinion that if outside evaluators are used, their roles must be defined and clearly understood before the evaluation process begins. Such clarification is important to offset misunderstandings on the part of the individuals in the school. Naicker and Waddy (2002:18-19) list the three stages where the supervisory team has to be involved in when conducting external evaluation, namely prior to the evaluation, during and after the external evaluation. It is very important not only for the team members to know and understand their roles during these stages, but also for the principal and the school whose assistance and support would be required during all these stages. Drake and Roe (1999:291) contend that not having a clear understanding about everyone's roles can have a negative impact on the evaluation process.

2.6.3.1 The role of the supervisory team prior to the external evaluation

According to Naicker and Waddy (2002:18), the supervisory team under the team leader agrees with the school on dates for a pre-evaluation visit, collecting the school's documentation and post-evaluation feedback to appropriate personnel. Naicker and Waddy (2002:18) also maintain that during this stage, the supervisory team visits the school to discuss all the necessary arrangements, explain the procedures to the staff and answer the questions that the staff members may have. This is a crucial stage because it is during this stage that staff members are made aware of what is expected of them. The concerns of the staff members as well as the fear that they may have for the coming of the outside evaluators in their school can be addressed.

During this stage the supervisory team decides on the nature of the evaluation and how evaluation responsibilities can be shared (Naicker &Waddy, 2002:18). Pretorius (1998:104) points out that a style of consensus and shared decision-making is important because every member of staff can then be accountable. Naicker and Waddy (2002:18) also contend that the supervisory team has to provide the school with a brief profile of the team members, information about the duration of their visit to the school and the subjects/learning areas and other areas that are to be evaluated. In this way everyone is made aware of what is going to happen during the external evaluation and confusion is minimised.

2.6.3.2 The role of the supervisory team during the external evaluation

During the evaluation period, the supervisory team carries out its functions according to previously agreed times and other arrangements. The team scrutinises all relevant records such as attendance registers, records of learners' performance, curriculum plans, learners' personal record files and notebooks (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:18). The information obtained from these documents can be used to help learners to improve their performance, to provide essential information to educators and to address areas in need of improvement (Squelch & Lemmer, 1994:13). As Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:6) put it, the quality of education in the classroom should always be the main concern.

According to Naicker and Waddy (2002:18), the supervisory team should spend at least fifty percent, that is, half of their time at the school observing lessons. This shows how important educative teaching is. Thus, the quality of education in the classroom should always be the major concern for all stakeholders. Jones (1993:69) maintains that classroom observation is likely to be more effective in improving teaching if the focus of the observer is narrowed to certain specific features of an educator's work in the classroom. An educator's activities in the classroom are many and varied, if the observer attempts to observe all of these, little is likely to be gained and the result is likely to be some rather superficial observations (Jones, 1993:69). Therefore, the supervisory team should also observe activities outside the classroom in order to have a better understanding of the individual learner.

The supervisory team also has to study the school premises and resources that are available in the school and give feedback on what has been observed (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:18). Nias,

Southworth and Campbell (1992:198) regard the availability of resources, especially educator time and commitment, and materials and equipments as one of the conditions that facilitate or inhibit the improvement and development in the school. Thus, the supervisory team should establish what resources are available in the school and/or whether those resources are enough and suitable to address the needs of the individuals in the school. Moreover, Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:128) state that resources also need to be appropriate to the school in terms of its vision and aims. Therefore, the team should also interview a sample of all the stakeholders (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:19). This can help the team to acquire more information about the individuals as well as the school and get the views and perceptions of the stakeholders.

2.6.3.3 The role of the supervisory team after the external evaluation

After the evaluation, the supervisory team processes all the information they (team members) collected and finalise their ratings. The team at the conclusion of their visit also gives an initial oral report to the school (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:19). The Department of Education (2001d:6) adds that the supervisors must provide a brief oral report to individual educators on the quality of their work, recommendations as to how the school might improve its practice, a brief oral report to heads of each learning area evaluated on quality of work in that learning area and a brief report to the principal on the main judgements. These individuals should take oral reports seriously as they form an integral part of the external evaluation.

At a later date, but normally not longer than a week after the evaluation, the team leader must return to the school to provide a more detailed oral report to the principal, school governing body, school management team and professional support teams (Department of Education, 2001d:6).

2.6.4 The role of the district support services in whole-school evaluation

Too often, there is a big gap between the intentions of the policy formulators and what actually happens in the classroom or what is actually experienced by educators in the school as policy implementers. Samoff (in Christie, 1999:284) maintains that policies are best understood in terms of practices on the ground rather than in terms of idealist statements of intention or blueprints for action. Therefore, the district officials should not only monitor the implementation of the policies but should also ensure that these policies are well understood by the implementers. Districts, as they

are close to the school should, therefore, have support services which have to address the needs, the concerns and the problems of the individual schools.

Thus, for whole-school evaluation to succeed, the district support services should monitor and support schools in their efforts to raise standards and the quality of educational provision (Department of Education, 2001b:9). But Chisholm (2000:84) maintains that the different ways in which provincial departments are vertically organized makes it difficult to talk of implementation in common terms across Provinces. According to Chisholm (2000:84), while some Provinces have provincial head offices followed by districts and then circuits and schools, others have an intervening level in the form of a region between Provincial Office and districts, for example, in the Provinces like, Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal and Limpopo.

District support services are also expected to co-ordinate staff development programmes in response to educators' individual professional needs, the findings of whole-school evaluation and the requirements of provincial and national policies and initiatives. And also district support services should guide schools in the implementation of the recommendations of whole-school evaluations (RSA, 2001:19). Because of different organisational structures and levels of authority, some districts, particularly those in the Provinces with regions may sometimes be unable to support the schools adequately. Districts in the Provinces with regions tend to be largely administrative entities with no curriculum support functions in evidence (Chisholm, 2000:84).

2.6.5 The role of the principal in whole-school evaluation

The executive authority for the professional management of schools is vested in the principal supported by the school governing body (RSA, 2001:19). The principal is the key to educational change and school improvement. Thus, the role that the principal plays in everything that takes place in the school is very crucial. Although the principal plays a crucial role, he/she relies on the support of other staff members, as he/she cannot run the school single-handedly. The principal may delegate to an appointee or nominee from the staff certain functions, including quality management matters, whenever the need arises (RSA, 2001:19-20). That certain tasks have been delegated to someone does not imply that the principal is no longer in charge. The principal has still to support and assist that individual so that the delegated task/s can be effectively executed.

The emphasis is always placed on the role of the school principal when it comes to the translation of policy initiatives into practice. Therefore, it is the principal's responsibility to ensure that whole-school evaluation is conducted successfully should his/her school be selected for whole-school evaluation. As Lund (1996:11) suggests, the success of any project is crucially linked to the effectiveness of the person who manages it. Terry (1999:30) maintains that a principal needs to know when to move ahead to keep reform efforts going and when to slow down to firm the ground. The principal needs to plan for various stages in the implementation of whatever change being introduced in the school. Accordingly, the principal has to perform certain duties at different stages of whole-school evaluation, namely prior to the evaluation, during and after the evaluation (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:19-20).

2.6.5.1 The role of the principal prior to the external evaluation

According to the National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation (RSA, 2001:20), the principal should identify an evaluation co-ordinator to liaise with the evaluation team during the whole-school evaluation exercise. Naicker and Waddy (2002:19) add that the principal should do this in liaison with the school governing body and the school management team. For whole-school evaluation to be successful, all staff members should be fully involved from the onset. Therefore, all staff members should be involved in identifying the whole-school evaluation co-ordinator. An evaluation co-ordinator chosen by all staff members is more likely to earn the respect of the staff and give educators ownership of the school's management.

The principal should also acquaint himself/herself with the reasons, requirements and guidelines for the evaluation and also be able to explain these as well as the whole process of whole-school evaluation to the staff members. The principal should also be able to answer whatever questions the stakeholders (the school governing body, the school management team, the educators and to a lesser extent, the learners) may have regarding everything concerning the whole-school evaluation. According to Naicker and Waddy (2002:19), questions could be about the reasons for the evaluation, why the school (their particular school) was chosen, the areas to be sampled, how they as stakeholders should be involved in the process, dates for evaluation and how the evaluation is to be undertaken, the follow-up and so on. If the stakeholders have the necessary information about the whole-school evaluation, they are likely to support the principal to ensure that the whole process is successful.

As is the case with all other departmental initiatives, the principal should encourage and motivate all stakeholders to ensure that they understand the process and also to co-operate with the external supervisors. Some of these stakeholders may be apprehensive about the evaluation. The principal should also ensure that all required documentation is accurately prepared and ready for the supervisory team (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:19). Basically, the principal should ensure that all the necessary documents that may be needed by the external evaluators are in place even before the supervisory team members visit the school. He/she should also ensure that everyone in the school is well geared for the whole-school evaluation.

2.6.5.2 The role of the principal during the external evaluation

The principal should co-operate with the evaluation team, especially by providing interviews at appropriate times (RSA, 2001:20). The principal should also encourage everyone associated with the school to co-operate, support and respect the evaluation team. As Steyn (2002a:255) puts it, the principal should take the responsibility and accountability for the participation of stakeholders in school management. Likewise, Porter and Lemon (1988:31) maintain that the principal has a unique opportunity to shape the climate of a school and to change the behaviours, attitudes, goals, needs and even the values of subordinates.

The principal should also grant and facilitate full access to school records, policies, reports and other documentation, including those of the school governing body during external evaluations conducted by the supervisory units (RSA, 2001:20). Naicker and Waddy (2002:20) add that the principal should also co-operate fully with arrangements for lesson observations and the review of learners' books. These documents are very crucial to the supervisory team, as it is among the other things, through these documents that the supervisory team could be able to ascertain the status of the individual school. Without going through these documents, it could be difficult to these teams to determine whether the individual school needs assistance or not and/or what problems does the school experience.

2.6.5.3 The role of the principal after the external evaluation

The principal should, after reviewing the report and the recommendations of the evaluation team thoroughly distribute a written summary of the report with its main conclusions and

recommendations to all stakeholders within one week of receiving the report (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:20). Because of the uniqueness of schools, distributing the report may, in some instances, not be appropriate, adequate and effective in some schools. As a result of the poor educational background of some school governing body members and parents, particularly in the previous disadvantaged school, the principal may be required to play a crucial and leading role in discussing and/or interpreting the report/s with these individuals. As the National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation (RSA, 2001:20) suggests, the principal should disseminate, where appropriate information in other ways within two weeks of receiving the report.

The school principal should also, in collaboration with the support services and the school governing body, produce an improvement plan in response to recommendations made in the evaluation report within four weeks of the receipt of the written evaluation report (RSA, 2001:20). This should be done in consultation with all stakeholders if the school improvement plan is to be owned and supported by the school community. Thus, the principal should challenge others to identify purpose and create a vision and long-term goals that require their collective, creative efforts to accomplish (Weller & Weller, 2000:8).

Once the school improvement plan has been developed/completed, the principal should send it to the District Office (manager) for approval and should also work with the professional support services assigned to the school to implement the plan within the stipulated time frames (RSA, 2001:20). The principal should address those areas that have been identified by the report of the external evaluators as areas that need improvement (Department of Education, 2001d:7). The Ministry of Education (2003:4) cautions, however, that the school improvement plan must be realistic and manageable by the staff responsible for its implementation.

2.7 WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION IN DIFFERENT SCHOOL CONTEXTS

The school's environment in which any educational policy is put into practice is part of what shapes that particular policy. According to Hallinger, Bickman and Davies (1996:532), the school environment offers both constraints and resources that shape the situation in which the individual operates. Vandenberghe (1992:32) maintains that the internal functioning of a school is determined by many known and unknown factors. These factors have positive and/or negative impact on the implementation of any educational policy. Therefore, the school, especially the principal should not

only be aware of these factors but should also try to change those factors that may have a negative impact on the school.

The context in which the individuals work present different constraints, needs and opportunities (Hallinger et al, 1996:532). Thus, these factors in one way or another can influence the implementation of whole-school evaluation. Therefore, whole-school evaluation and its processes should be understood within the context of schools in which it is implemented or conducted. For example, a well-resourced school is more likely to implement whole-school evaluation better than the poorly resourced school. This is evident in South African schools where disparity between the former white schools and black schools still exist. Addressing contextual differences between schools has become one of the greatest challenges for school improvement (Van Wyk, 1999b:92). As a result some schools, particularly the previously disadvantaged schools struggle to implement some of the new policies, whereas others, particularly the previously advantaged schools have most of the needed resources to implement these new policies. Thus, previously advantaged schools remain advantaged while some previously disadvantaged schools still perform poorly. But the Department of Education (2000b:6) is concerned that there is very little said about redressing the imbalances of the past in whole-school evaluation. Thus, schools that are well resourced and performing well will be heaped with praise, while poor schools may perform poorly. But Naicker and Waddy (2002:14) argue that whole-school evaluation does not disadvantage schools that are in the disadvantaged areas, as individual circumstances are taken into account.

According to Quinlan and Davidoff (1997:13), the context of each individual school (the external factors) impacts on the school in a way that will shape its unique character. Similarly, the particular culture of each school and the composition of staff, learners and parents will also shape its unique qualities (the internal factors). Likewise, McNamara et al (2002:205) maintain that the process of whole-school evaluation should take into account the unique contextual factors of each school, specifically those factors relating to the socio-economic background of learners, range of learner ability and level of resources. The Department of Education (2000b:7) agrees that when evaluation reports are shared with parents, the context in which the school functions must be explained. For example, Quinlan and Davidoff (1997:13) maintain that as a result of the previous uneven distribution of resources in South Africa schools vary enormously in both their material and human resources. Therefore, the context of an under-resourced rural school compared with a well-resourced urban school impacts very differently on school life, including the morale and motivation

of educators, learners, parents and the community in general. This does not mean, though, that quality should be compromised. As the Department of Education (2000b:7) puts it, the quality of the school must be reported in relation to the quality of the entire system.

All schools share a particular identity determined by their core purpose of promoting teaching and learning for the purpose of achieving the aims of education (Davidoff & Lazarus, 2002:23). This does not, however, mean that the context within which each school operates is unimportant. As Eisner (1994:14) puts it, contexts within which educators work differ, learners differ, schools have different levels of resources and equally as important, educators differ with respect to their attitudes and backgrounds. Therefore, evaluators, particularly external evaluators should also take the contexts of schools into account when conducting their evaluations. There are, however, researchers who argue that this is not always the case. Often, evaluation criteria for whole-school evaluation are the same irrespective of where the school is situated (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:11). For example, Jansen (2001:560) maintains that in South Africa, a white urban school with middle-class parents, an established school infrastructure and an elite group of advantaged learners is measured on exactly the same basis as a black rural school serving the children of poor families in dilapidated buildings where a poor culture of teaching and learning exists. This puts advantaged schools in a better position while disadvantaged schools are further disadvantaged. As Jansen (2001:560) puts it, new policies, including whole-school evaluation increase the distance between rich and poor schools because of the capacity of the former to manage, interpret and implement the policy in its favour. This is because these policies do not take the circumstances of individual schools into account.

Moreover, some policy analysts argue that in South Africa the Department of Education's policy documents are idealistic texts in an essentially top-down policy process which is not rooted in the realities of schools or responsive to conditions on the ground (Christie, 1999:282). As a result these policies are not effectively implemented at some schools, as they do not meet the needs, expectations and circumstances of these schools. Sack (2002:6) is of the opinion that whole-school evaluation cannot be successfully implemented at some quarters because the bureaucrats try to adopt a one-size-fits all approach (cf 2.6). According to Jansen (2001:560), whole-school evaluation need to be implemented by well-trained educators who should provide detailed school improvement plans to ensure that schools progress beyond high levels of achievement. But most black and poor schools do not have educators who have such expertise. As a result whole-school

evaluation may yield unintended results/effects on a number of schools. As Christie (1999:282) puts it, for under-resourced communities and schools, the educational policies initiated in South Africa may produce the opposite effect, acting as extra-burdens rather than opportunities for improvement.

Cullingford (1997:120) is of the opinion that from whatever sources, from whatever country, the way to help schools improve rests on certain immutable principles. These include: the sense of the school as a center of change; the educator's feelings of responsibility or ownership over change; the close involvement of parents and the community; good clear systems of communication, sharing and support; the willingness to make changes happen over time; the encouragement of educator motivation and commitment; the support of educators through in-service education and trusting schools to develop their own policies and motivations without undue outside interference or detailed external control and inspection. Meanwhile, Heneveld (1994:3) lists a number of unsuccessful interventions that have been tried by other African countries to improve the quality of education. For example, changes to the number of years of schooling, to the language of instruction, to the management structure of the education system, to the availability of textbooks and in-service educator education, to the subjects taught and to school construction programmes. This shows that the effects of whole-school evaluation on schools cannot be predicted and its success and/or failure can depend on a number of factors. But Christie (1999:288) is of the opinion that the more knowledge that planners and policy-makers have of the actual conditions in schools, the more likely it is that their policies will be sensitive to them.

2.8 SUMMARY

In this chapter evaluation in education and the implementation of whole-school evaluation were explored. The local and international literature has been reviewed in order to determine how evaluation in education as well as the implementation of whole-school evaluation is viewed locally and internationally.

The study reveals that evaluation is crucial in any organisation, as it helps to determine whether the goals and/or objectives of that particular organisation have been achieved or not. Without evaluating the activities of the organisation (school) it can be difficult to ascertain whether there is quality teaching and learning in the school. Evaluation comes in different forms; some forms (types) of evaluation look at the individuals and others look at the institution as a whole. But,

irrespective of which type of evaluation is being used the primary aim is the improvement of the individuals in the school as well as the organisation (school) as a whole. Wiles and Bondi (2000:173) regard evaluation as the *bottom line* activity in all school improvement. As a result without evaluation it can be difficult to determine whether school's objectives, priorities and needs are achieved.

Many countries are engaged in restructuring and reform efforts with the goal of improving schooling and preparing learners for the future (Stoll, 1999:504). Whole-school evaluation has emerged as one of these reforms and the study reveals why countries adopted whole-school evaluation as part of their evaluation process. The manner in which whole-school evaluation is implemented varies from country to country. But in all instances, the role played by each individual is regarded as paramount for the whole-school evaluation to be implemented successfully. Therefore, for whole-school evaluation to be meaningful it needs to be well planned, well controlled and well co-ordinated.

The next chapter deals with the managerial role of the principal and disadvantaged schools. Both the role of the principal and disadvantaged schools is examined from the local and international point of view.

CHAPTER 3

THE MANAGERIAL ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL AND SCHOOLING IN DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS/COMMUNITIES

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Restructuring of school systems has been taking place in most parts of the world over the past few decades (Dimmock & O' Donoghue, 1997:5). Dalin and Rust (1996:4) maintain that in education, innovation and reform take place at a number of different levels, from classroom to changes of the entire educational system. This has influenced the manner in which each individual in the school environment performs his/her role. The changing roles also have an impact not only on the performance of the learners but also on the school as a whole. Since the principal influences anything taking place in the school, his/her role needs to be given special attention. Dimmock and O' Donoghue (1997:5) maintain there is a need for a variety of studies which are aimed at understanding the various aspects of principals' work as part of current restructuring. These aspects should, however, be understood in the context in which they are performed.

The role of the principal is undergoing significant change and complex issues and challenges require that principals should acquire new and improved skills in order to cope (Hoberg, 1993:65). Van der Westhuizen (1991:1) concurs and maintains that traditionally the educational leader (the principal) was merely the head educator and the task of the school (i.e. what the school had to achieve) was of limited complexity. However, changes taking place worldwide have once again put the role of the principal in the limelight. The principal should, therefore, ensure that each individual in the school not only understands his/her new roles, but also performs them effectively. Squelch and Lemmer (1994:vii) state school principals and educators are under increasing pressure to cope with these challenges while simultaneously building and maintaining effective schools. Van der Westhuizen (1991:1-2) contends that as a result of the increasing complexity of the school as an organisation, the principal is subjected to changing demands especially in respect of his/her management task. Glasman and Hech (1992:10) add that how the individual principal reacts to these may depend on his/her own values and beliefs as well as organisational and political variables associated with the school and community context (e.g. district size, level of schooling, learners'

socio-economic status, pressures from district and community, access to knowledge and staff characteristics. This indicates that the principal is the important figure in the school environment.

According to Goldring (in Murphy & Hallinger, 1992:81), the success of local school initiatives and/or departmental initiatives depends upon principals' abilities to adapt their roles to new realities. However, these roles should be understood in the context in which each school operates, thus, Squelch and Lemmer (1994:19) argue that each school is unique and not all schools have the same needs or demands, nor are they faced with exactly the same challenges or problems. The principal should take the uniqueness of the school into account whenever performing his/her roles. Problems and development within a particular school need to be analysed and responded to while taking into consideration the dynamics of the school as part of a broader-educational bureaucracy. Issues with which the school is faced must also be understood and responded to within the context of societal dynamics (Davidoff & Lazarus, 1997:34).

This section looks at the managerial role of the principal as set out in both the international and local literature. Attention is also given to schooling in disadvantaged schools/communities.

3.2 THE MANAGERIAL ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL

Principalship is a multifaceted job. While some roles are peripheral to the job of the principal, some are central and deserve to be given a high priority by him/her (Ngcongo, 1995:31). For example, principals should ensure that they perform their managerial roles in such a way that educational reforms, including whole-school evaluation are effectively implemented. The success or failure of whole-school evaluation and other reforms depends on the roles played by the principals. However, no principal can be characterised by only the roles that he/she plays or should play. Successful principals exercise different roles in different circumstances (Smith, Sparks & Thurlow, 2001:10). Thus, for any school to be successful, the principal should, amongst the other things, fulfill his/her managerial roles. Terry (1999:32) explained that the role of the principal has always been and continues to be crucial to the effectiveness of the school. Squelch and Lemmer (1994:11-14) concur that although the principal plays a crucial role in making things happen in a school, he/she alone cannot be held responsible for school improvement and school effectiveness. The principal should be supported by an efficient team of staff and the parent community.

Oldroyd et al (1996:42) regard managerial roles as the specified set of activities and expectations that define the part played by the manager in the organisation. Everard and Morris (1996:5) regard managing change as an essential function of the managerial role. Thus, the managerial role of the principal is that of transforming the staff and everyone in the school so that they are able to transform the school. He/she does this by paying special attention to their developmental needs and encouraging them to put the interests of the school above their own interests. As Fullan (in Du Four & Berkey, 1995:2) puts it, it is only when enough people within an organisation change that the organisation can be transformed. Terry (1999:28) maintains that the success of the principal is measured by the improvement in performance of others. Thus, the principal should challenge all individuals associated with the school to identify objectives and create a vision and long-term goals that require their collective, creative efforts to accomplish (Weller & Weller, 2000:8).

Portin, Shen and Williams (1998:6) are of the opinion that the role of principal can be characterised by two trends, namely growing ambiguity and complexity. For example, principals are expected to accomplish different things by different groups. Dean (1995:4) explains that all leaders (principals) have to live with other people's view of their role. Everyone connected with the school always have ideas about what the principal ought to do, as a result they always exert pressure on the principal to conform to their expectations. Therefore, the principal should reconcile these views with his/her own view of his/her own role (Dean, 1995:4). Changes taking place in the education system demand that principals should know how to deal with these changes. The problem, however, is that most principals lack the necessary skills required for success in some aspects of the changing role (Portin et al, 1998:6).

To overcome these challenges, principals need to acquire new managerial and leadership skills which will enable them to carry out their tasks competently (Squelch & Lemmer, 1994:1). According to Van der Westhuizen (1991:3), very few principals have undergone such training. Hoberg (1993:69) argues that principals in South Africa are expected to manage their schools effectively, although little has been offered to them in terms of appropriate high level management training or even basic management training. This deficiency needs to be addressed soon so that principals are able to perform their roles effectively. Hoberg (1993:69) also warns that the principal's formal leadership behaviour and effective managerial skill should never be under-estimated, for this will inevitably determine the extent to which educators, learners and parents will be prepared to become committed to the school as an organisation. However, Van der Westhuizen

(1991:60) cautions that one should be careful not to over-emphasise management work in the school at the cost of the other activities.

According to Squelch and Lemmer (1994:11), the school principal has a number of managerial and leadership roles to fulfill and that it is by no means a simple matter. As a result of continuous and accelerated changes taking place globally, the principal's roles have become more complex. Vandenberghe (1995:2) maintains that in many countries there are clear pressures for reform. As a result of which principals face new and complex challenges that require new skills. The question, therefore, is no longer whether or not the principal has a managerial task, but rather how well he/she is equipped for his/her managerial task. Principals are being asked to undergo a metamorphis (Murphy & Hallinger, 1992:81). School principals, therefore, need to be helped to become more effective in their roles.

The effective functioning of a school greatly depends on the professional conduct of the school principal and the leadership roles he/she fulfills (Van der Westhuizen, 1991:3). But Robbins and De Cenzo (2004:270) are of the opinion that not only managers (principals) play roles, all people in the organisation play roles. These individuals engage in behaviour patterns that go with the positions they occupy in the organisation. Each individual should perform his/her role so that the institution should function effectively. Roles performed by everyone in the institution are, therefore, necessary for the effective functioning of any institution. According to Hoy and Miskel (1996:36), roles derive their meaning from other roles in the system and in this sense are complementary. For example, it is difficult, if not impossible, to define either the role of the learner or that of an educator in a school without specifying the relationship of the educator to the learner. As a result Hoy and Miskel (1996:36) are of the opinion that the role of the principal is also dependent on its relationship to the roles of the educator and the learner. Thus, different role requirements (expectations) can create communication barriers (Robbins & De Cenzo, 2004:271). This may be compounded by the fact that each role comes with its own jargon that sets the parameter of the role in relation to other roles in the institution. Furthermore, fulfilling role requirements often requires individuals to selectively interpret events. Therefore, the principal should not only perform his/her managerial roles, but should also understand the requirements of these roles and the expectations of everyone associated with the school. However, the principal should take cognisance of the fact that no principal is able to fulfill the expectations of all the individuals in the school and/or associated

within the school. Nevertheless, the principal must perform his/her managerial roles to the satisfaction of all the stakeholders.

The following have been identified as some of the cardinal managerial roles that the principal should perform. These roles should be played in pursuance of the educational reforms, including whole-school evaluation (cf 3.3). It should be pointed out, though, that the following managerial roles are a selection of the many that are possible. These roles are not all inclusive and no doubt that others can also be identified.

3.2.1 Providing leadership

According to Hoberg (1993:65), the principal occupies a unique leadership position and exercises influence in structural, operational and instructional matters in the school. Thus, the principal should always be in the forefront of whatever activity is taking place at school both as a leader and manager. The principal should, therefore, perform his/her managerial role by providing leadership to the staff, learners and parents and other interested individuals so that the school is able to achieve its objectives. As Gronn (1996:17) puts it, the hierarchy of roles comprises core managerial work (planning, communicating, appraising, setting output targets, finding resources, coaching, selecting and inducting, etcetera. Squelch and Lemmer (1994:1) concur that good leadership is regarded by many as synonymous with the effective role of the principal. Role-players, especially educators and parents, always look to the principal for leadership, that is, direction, motivation and guidance. Terry (1999:28) maintains that effective and skilled principals are able to create by both example and direction an atmosphere that breeds motivated and successful educators, an excited and energised staff, inspired and stimulated learners in an effective school setting. This also involves other role-players such as parents, the community at large and other individuals that have an interest in the school.

Sergiovanni (1992:41), however, warns against focusing almost exclusively on leadership as something forceful, direct and interpersonal instead of paying at least equal attention to providing substitutes for leadership. Sergiovanni (1992:41) is of the opinion that if paying attention to substitute leadership can be successful educators and other individuals in the school can become more self-managing and this can enable the principal to spend time on other issues. This does not in any way trivialise the importance of leadership in the school or any other institution. As Thody

(1998:1) suggests, effective leadership creates effective schools. According to Portin et al (1998:5), leadership covers the important role of supervising the curriculum, improving the instructional program, working with the staff to identify a vision and direction for the school and building a close and congruent working relationship between the school and its community. This suggests that the role of the principal in providing leadership in the school should not be compromised, as it is one of the most important factors contributing to the effectiveness of a school (Squelch & Lemmer, 1994:1).

Thus, for school effectiveness and improvement to be realised, the educational manager (the principal) should provide the following two types of leaderships, namely, instructional leadership and transformational leadership. However, Vandenberghe (1992:32) contends that there is no single person who is able to do this in a productive way, thus, there is a clear need for a leadership team. Meanwhile, Drake and Roe (1999:131) argue that although many approaches to leadership have in some circumstances proven to be positive, no one approach or style is a panacea. Therefore, the leader needs to be armed with an arsenal of leadership approaches to draw from as conditions change. For example, the principal should provide strong leadership in order for the staff not only to understand whole-school evaluation but also to be motivated to implement it.

3.2.1.1 Instructional leadership

The principal's main function is to create conditions in the school that ensure that the learners receive quality instruction both inside and outside the classroom. As Hanson (1996:92) expresses it, principals' efforts to shape a supportive instructional environment within the school (for example, high achievement expectations, participating parents, quality educator selection and educator empowerment) can have an important influence on the teaching-learning process. Therefore, principals need to redirect their thinking back to the learners. However, Drake and Roe (1999:170) argue that this is not to say that, in addition to the many tasks already expected of the principal, he/she should now assume responsibility for teaching a class for part of each day. Rather, improving teaching and learning should be the primary focus of his/her time. The principal can only improve teaching and learning if he/she knows and understands what the educators and learners are doing inside and/or outside the classroom. Therefore, principals must know what to expect from educators if they (principals) are to provide effective instruction in the schools.

However, principals spend the largest portion of their time in their offices not in the classrooms (Whitaker, 1997:1). Portin et al (1998:7) concur and ascribe this to external pressure and priorities. As a result principals are increasingly becoming managers rather than instructional leaders. The fact that principals spend a limited amount of time with the learners suggests that there is little direct involvement by principals in the instructional processes. Principals who spend most of the time in their offices fail to realise that school business of major importance is found not in the office, but in the classrooms, hallways, playgrounds and cafeterias. These principals can never have a sense of the school unless they immerse themselves in the atmosphere beyond the office door. In contrast, principals who create an exciting and reinforcing learning environment will find that learners and educators will want to do what needs to be done (Whitaker, 1997:1-3).

The role played by the principal in instructional matters should not only be seen as an instructional leadership role but also as a managerial role. The principal does not only provide leadership and direct the activities of the educators and the learners, but also manages, controls and monitors these activities. Mosoge and Van der Westhuizen (1998:78) suggest that to manage a school effectively, principals need to be both managers and leaders. This implies that the principal influences instruction and learning in the school whether he/she likes it or not.

According to Smith et al (2001:10), instructional leadership focuses on the core mission of the school, namely classroom instruction, paying attention to what is happening at the chalk face. Thus, the principal as instructional leader should work with educators to promote classroom learning (Stoll & Fink, 1996:105). Therefore, the principal should always be available to provide guidance and support whenever necessary. Kruger and Van Zyl (2000:9) maintain that the principal as instructional leader must ensure that teaching and learning activities are performed well and that any appropriate tools that could enhance the teaching-learning situation are made available to the whole school. This can only be possible if the principal is working closely with the educators and knows when his/her assistance is needed.

Smith et al (2001:10) regard the principal as the meta-controller of classroom processes and the quality controller of classroom educators. However, Smith et al (2001:10) warn that this does not imply that the principal takes an authoritarian stance towards educators, but merely that he/she provides direction to the process of teaching and learning. Hoberg (1994:45) is also of the opinion that educators should be invited to discuss their problems regularly with the school principal. By so

doing the principal is fulfilling both his/her managerial role and leadership role. Blairs (1992:30) suggests that the role of the principal has always had two major dimensions, namely, instructional leader and school manager that are inextricably linked. According to Cunningham (2000:140), instructional leadership focuses on curriculum and instructional development, staff development, evaluation, and the continuous improvement of teaching and learning. Therefore, the principal as an instructional leader should be actively involved in what is taking place in the school both inside and outside the classroom.

However, Blairs (1992:32) is of the opinion that many of the changes that are occurring are threatening the dominance of the instructional leadership role. This threat lies not in the changes to instructional leadership but in the effects outlined on the managerial aspect of the principal's workload. The principal should not neglect his/her instructional role and concentrate only on the other roles.

3.2.1.2 Transformational leadership

The principal has, according to Burns (1996:350), to change the behaviour and beliefs of all stakeholders in the school setup and unite them behind a new vision of the school's future. Mosoge and Van Westhuizen (1998:78) maintain that principals should rally people around a set of ideals that represent the shared expectations, beliefs and values of the school and utilise these ideals or mission to guide and give direction to educational activities. Thus, the principal inspires, motivates and supports all role-players to understand and accept educational changes. Armstrong and Armstrong (1996:24) maintain that the principal empowers others to act, grow and become leaders themselves.

Thus, the role of the principal is that of transforming the staff and everyone in the school so that they are able to transform the school. He/she does this by paying special attention to their developmental needs. Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:154) maintain that principals need to be perceptive so that they know when to push and when to leave the situation unchallenged. Being perceptive means being sensitive to the moods of others and to their needs and organisational priorities. According to Hoy and Miskel (2001:414), principals as transformational leaders are expected to define the need for change; create new visions and muster commitment to the visions; concentrate on long-term goals; inspire followers to transcend their own interests to pursue higher

goals; change the organisation to accommodate their vision rather than work within the existing ones and mentor followers to take greater responsibility for their own development and that of others in the institution. Law and Glover (2000:26) concur that transformational leaders are people-oriented. Being people-oriented, these leaders (principals) build relationships with the individuals in schools and help followers develop goals and identify strategies rather than emphasise tasks and performance. These strategies allow principals to motivate, inspire and unite educators and other individuals in schools towards common goals (Black, 1998:35)

Black (1998:34) maintains that principals constantly need to read the school's culture and in collaboration with educators, learners, parents, staff and other leaders (deputy principal/s and heads of department) rewrite compatible visions and plans for their school's future. Thus, the patience and persistence of every individual in the school over several years holds the key to such transformation. The principal should, therefore, win the respect and trust of his/her staff in order for them to work cooperatively. Hoy and Miskel (2001:415) are of the opinion that in transformational leadership, leaders are admired, respected and trusted and followers identify themselves with their leaders and want to emulate them. Both want to become the best and both want to shape the school in a new direction. This develops as the principal manages to change the mindset of people, their attitudes, values and ways of doing things (Mosoge & Van Westhuizen, 1998:80). But the principal should not take or regard transformational leadership as a panacea. Therefore, principals should always provide such a leadership with great care.

3.2.2 Facilitating meaningful change

According to Everard and Morris (1996:5), change can be initiated from within the school or imposed from outside. In both circumstances the principal has a crucial role to play in order to ensure that the individuals in the school and/or other stakeholders not only understand but also implement such a change as required. As Black (1998:35) expresses it, school leaders (principals) who facilitate change involve others, including educators, support staff, learners and parents to help make decisions and solve problems. Bradshaw and Buckner (1994:78) argue that although principals are crucial in bringing about significant change in schools, they cannot, however, bring about significant change. Thus, all sectors of the school community must be involved if change efforts are to succeed. But the principal should always be in the forefront and should fulfill his/her managerial role.

Effective implementation of change relies on the active involvement of staff at each stage of the process; otherwise the change will never become fully operational, incorporated into everyday practice (Garrett, 1997:102). Thus, the principal should always work with others who should also make a large number of interventions in their attempt to bring about and manage change in the school. According to Erasmus and Van der Westhuizen (1996:235), the principal should encourage teamwork among educators so that they take part in the day-to-day decisions made in the school. For Pretorius (1998:104) this would mean a style of consensus and shared decision-making because everyone at school should be or is accountable. Teamwork, however, does not imply that the principal should shift his/her responsibility to others. The principal is, first and foremost, the representative of the Department of Education at the school level and, therefore, is the first person to account for whatever happens in the school. Principals should take responsibility and accountability for the participation of stakeholders in school management (Steyn, 2002a:255). For the principal to facilitate change meaningfully, he/she needs to acquire skills to manage it (change). Thus, Bradshaw and Buckner (1994:79) are of the opinion that principals and other members of the school community must be taught the specific skills needed to bring about significant change.

According to Bradshaw and Buckner (1994:79), the significant changes being demanded of schools can only be accomplished through shared decision-making that motivates people to change. As Du Four and Berkey (1995:2) express it, focusing on people is the most effective way to change any organisation. Therefore, for any change to be effectively implemented in the school, the principal needs to fulfill his/her managerial role. He/she should, amongst the other things, ensure that change is properly managed at all levels.

3.2.2.1 Managing change

Bringing about lasting significant change is difficult (Bradshaw & Buckner, 1994:78). Therefore, change like all other management functions should be managed. Fullan and Miles (1999:83) maintain that change initiatives require that substantial effort be devoted to such tasks as monitoring implementation, keeping everyone informed of what is happening, linked multi-change projects (typical in most schools), locating unsolved problems and taking clear coping action. Likewise, Pretorius (1998:105) proposes that the management of change is a complex process, brought about by various methods. Therefore, it cannot be left to chance. As a result the principal of the future should become more and more of a change agent.

Fullan (1993:39) argues that every person in the school that is committed to making continuous improvements must be a change agent, citing two reasons for this. First, since no one person can possibly understand the complexities of change in dynamically complex systems, it follows that the responsibility of managing change cannot be left to certain individuals. Second, and more fundamental, the conditions for the new paradigm of change cannot be established by formal leaders (principals) working by themselves. As Fullan (1993:39) expresses it, each and every educator has the responsibility to help create an organisation capable of individual and collective inquiry and continuous renewal or it will not happen. For change to be implemented effectively those that are charged with its implementation and management must always regard it as an attempt to school improvement. School improvement cannot be realised if the status quo is maintained. But the management of change is not always an easy task because of the attitude of the individuals towards change and its processes. Garrett (1997:95) argues that the management of change is fraught with tensions: tensions between desired change and imposed, often unwanted change; between planned and unplanned; between systematic planning and evolutionary change. As a result this can cause a great deal of upset and disturbance in the school. But Garrett (1997:95) contends that this is not always bad if change is well managed. It is easy to manage change that has been initiated by the school if the staff members were involved from the initial stages than managing change that has been imposed on the school or change that has been introduced from outside the school.

Pretorius (1998:113) maintains that each aspect of change should be managed within the unique circumstances of each school and the unique creativity of all staff members is needed. It is only by individuals taking action to alter their own environments that there is any chance for deep change (Fullan, 1993:40).

3.2.3 Maintaining and developing resources

Everard and Morris (1996:7) maintain that a school manager needs to be able to plan, organise and control all his/her resources. Dimmock and Hattie (1994:41) add that the ability to respond immediately to educational problems is best achieved if control of the resources needed to make a response is closest to the problem. The principal should, therefore, not only ensure that the necessary and adequate resources are available, but also that these resources are well managed. Everard and Morris (1996:7) classify the tangible resources of an organisation as follows: human

(the people employed by the organisation), material (building and equipment) and financial (the funds available to the organisation). The managerial activities particularly concerned with the maintenance and development of resources are as follows: human – selection, appraisal, counseling, career planning, job design, training, project work, couching; material – purchasing, stock control, asset management; and financial – budgeting, cost control, fund-raising, cost/benefit analysis (Everard & Morris, 1996:7).

Principals should always acquire resources and also ensure that these resources are allocated in the manner that is consistent with the needs, goals and priorities of the school. Resources should also be aligned with the programmes and/or activities taking place in the school to ensure that the desired outcomes/goals are successfully achieved. However, Everard and Morris (1996:7) caution that it is not enough to maintain resources, but the principal should also pay attention to developing resources so that they meet new challenges and needs. Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:128) concur, maintaining that not only do the resources need to be available to the school, but also need to be appropriate to the school in terms of its vision and aims. Thus, existing resources need to be adapted to meet the need of the school (Everard & Morris, 1996:203).

Of all resources, human resources are the most important. Therefore, the human resources need to be developed and well managed. According to Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:32), the human resources aspect of a school involves issues concerning members of the staff (education managers, educators and support staff), the parents, the learners, various community leaders and groupings, education administrators, and various education support service personnel providing itinerant services to the school.

3.2.4 Supervision

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993:4) regard supervision as a key role and function in the operation of schools. But the concern is the form, the substance of supervision, how educators feel its influence and what its effects have on teaching and learning. According to Dagley and Orso (1991:73), supervision can refer to a developmental process that includes efforts designed to improve the instructional behaviours of individual educators. Therefore, the principal and/or any other person who occupies a supervisory role must take corrective steps if the activities of the subordinates are

not in line with the goals of the school. Thus, the principal requires some mechanism to ensure that the staff members are adequately meeting learners' needs (Walker, 1990:12).

Glatthorn (in Walker, 1990:12) is of the opinion that in an effort to meet the diverse needs of each individual educator and the school as a whole, principals can consider introducing a system of differentiated supervision. Oliva and Pawlas (2001:23) maintain that the supervisor (principal) exercises various roles within each of three domains: instructional, curricular and staff development. Following one or more of these major areas, the principal assists educators in the improvement of instruction, curricular planning and improvement and personal and professional growth and development. Walker (1990:14), however, warns that differential supervision is not a panacea for solving all supervisory problems but attempts to provide a framework to cater to both school and individual needs. The principal should, therefore, know and understand the needs of both the individual educators and those of the school to be able to select an appropriate option (s). Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993:203) make the following distinction between general supervision and clinical supervision. General supervision refers to the meaningful classroom interventions that are built upon healthy organisational climates, facilitated by credible leadership and premised on a reasoned educational programme. Meanwhile, clinical supervision refers to face-to-face contact with educators the intent of improving instruction and increasing professional growth. But general supervision and clinical supervision are interdependent. As a result general supervision cannot be sufficient without clinical supervision and visa versa.

Walker (1990:13) regards the following as the options generally agreed to be sufficient to meet the diverse developmental needs of staff: clinical supervision, co-operation professional development and self-directed or individualised professional development. These options are essential to ensure the school improvement. According to Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993:104), improving schools by helping educators to reflect on their practice, to learn more about what they do and why, to strive for self-improvement, to share what they know with others and to strive to improve their practice is at the heart of what supervision seeks to accomplish. On the other hand, Oliva and Pawlas (2001:40) argue that by providing supervision, the educational system is declaring that educators are not completely free to run their own classrooms as they see fit. As Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993:59) put it, in some instances supervision as practiced by many supervisors is not only non-professional, it is dehumanising and unethical.

3.2.5 Evaluation

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993:164) contend that evaluation is a growing concern in education. Different individuals emphasise evaluation for various reasons. For example, emphasising that evaluation could arise from a desire to find out what is wrong with the schools, why test scores are declining, why schools seem ineffective in controlling violence and vandalism, teenage pregnancies and drug abuse. However, evaluation can also be seen as a way of holding schools accountable to taxpayers and funding agencies for the money they spend. Others, such as the university researchers, are seeking to increase information about effective programmes or teaching strategies. For Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:84), the purpose of evaluation is to inform future planning and ultimately development. Mayo (1997:269) agrees that evaluations that were formerly used only to measure educator competence are also now expected to foster an educator's development and growth. However, evaluation should not only be confined to educators, the activities of every individual in the school should also be evaluated and steps should be taken to make improvement where necessary. As Nevo (1995:12) expresses it, almost everything can be an object of evaluation and evaluation should not be limited to the evaluation of learners and school personnel.

Sergiovanni and Starrratt (1993:164-167) and Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:84-86) list the following as some of the issues that should be looked into when considering evaluation:

- Why should principals evaluate? According to Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:85), it is important that participants in the evaluation processes are aware of and committed to the purpose of the evaluation. In particular, the school needs to know how the evaluation will be utilised in the process of reporting and future planning. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993:167) contend that the purpose for which evaluation is undertaken always shape the form and process of evaluation. It is, therefore, imperative that all participants and those to be affected by evaluation know and understand the purpose of evaluation.
- What should be evaluated? Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993:164) are of the opinion that many things or many people can be the object of an evaluation. Therefore, participants should know beforehand as to what is to be evaluated. This can, to some extent, minimise uncertainty, as everyone knows what is to evaluate. Likewise, Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:85) maintain that one of the ways to address resistance to and fears about evaluation is to provide all participants

with an opportunity to participate in the development of criteria for evaluation which act as indicators of achievement.

- Who should be involved in the evaluation? According to Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993:164), evaluation is carried on by a number of individuals in the educational universe. For example, supervisors (principals) evaluate educators and programmes and educators evaluate learners. It is against this background that Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993:165) are of the opinion that when discussing evaluation in education, who is doing the evaluation makes a considerable difference to the discussion. According to Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:85-86), all people who are particularly involved in or directly affected by any aspect of the evaluation should be involved in some way. If all participants are involved in evaluation they are more likely to develop a positive attitude towards it.
- When will evaluation take place? Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:86) regard evaluation as a process that should be structured into the ongoing work of the school's life. Therefore, it should be conducted on a continuous basis.
- How should the evaluation be pursued? According to Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:86), the way in which the evaluation is pursued is a large factor in determining its success. It is, therefore, important that everyone involved in the evaluation should know how the evaluation should be pursued.

These questions provide the guidelines for the standard evaluation procedures and the principal should, therefore, guide his/her staff through these guidelines.

3.2.6 Building and maintaining a winning team

The school principal has a very important role in helping educators to form teams that can ensure that there is effective teaching and learning in the school. He/she should ensure that these groups work effectively and collaborate with one another 'synergistically' to achieve the task of the organisation (Everard & Morris, 1996:156). The principal should not only build and maintain a winning team, but also ensure that such a team is well managed. Steyn (1996:126) regards team building as a process that involves the formal work group developing an awareness of those conditions that keep it from functioning effectively and then proceeding to take action to eliminate those conditions. The principal should identify and also try to eliminate those problems that may prevent the group members from working together effectively.

According to Everard and Morris (1996:156), there are two complementary components in the building of an effective team: selection of the members and the training of the team. Thus, the principal should consider the strengths and weaknesses of his/her staff. Squelch and Lemmer (1994:70-71) list the following benefits of teamwork:

- The greatest benefit is cooperation. People want the team to do well and be successful so they are motivated to work together instead of competing individually.
- People who have learnt to support and trust one another share information instead of keeping it to them. In this way new ideas and innovative action flow freely so that all can reap the benefits.
- Resources, special talents and strengths are shared instead of uncovered by teamwork.
- Better quality decisions are made when people work together in groups. In this way decisions are not imposed upon people.
- Morale is higher when people work together in teams than when they work in isolation.
- Finally, excellence results from teamwork. Everyone wants the team to look as good as possible and, therefore, they give their best for the common good.

A winning team is developed in stages over a period of time and leaders and members must work tirelessly to maintain the team (Squelch & Lemmer, 1994:75). Squelch and Lemmer (1994:76) list the following five stages involved in building a team: forming a group identity; defining tasks and goals; bonding; processing and assimilating.

3.2.7 Developing human resources

Changing syllabi, changing approaches to teaching, changing management and governance, changing laws about forms of discipline – all these changes mean that educators are constantly faced with having to adjust to new circumstances. This can become very stressful if they are not given support to cope with all these demands (Davidoff & Lazarus, 1997:137). Therefore, the principal should not only manage but should also develop all personnel so that they can be able to achieve the school's objectives. As Swanepoel, Erasmus, Van Wyk and Schenk (1998:494) put it, the importance of human resources development (HRD) as a means of ensuring that organisations maintain their competitiveness in an ever-changing environment cannot be overemphasized.

According to Swanepoel et al (1998:494), the main focus of HRD is learning and its principal aim is to attain the objectives of both the organisation and the individual. Human resources development emphasises the concept of life long learning. Likewise, Dunlop (1995:147) maintains that there is a need for a life long education process that keeps pace with the continuous changes taking place. Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:147) argue that without ongoing programmes and processes to encourage and support staff development, schools become out of touch with educational trends and educators lose the sense of renewal and inspiration which is such an essential part of meaningful education (both for themselves and for their learners). Van Staden (in Prinsloo, 2003:216) lists the following as the aims of human resource development:

- To improve educators' performance.
- To give guidance to educators so that they can develop and grow to the highest possible level of professional expertise.
- To serve the primary aims of the education system, i.e. the promotion and attainment of a culture of teaching and learning.
- To provide acceptance, meaningful programmes which enable educators to achieve their personal aims and those of the system.
- To raise the quality of education and task fulfillment.
- To lead to greater job satisfaction.
- To identify technical skills that needs to be developed, and identify and develop management potential.

Furthermore, Prinsloo (2003:216) maintains that human resource development is concerned with expanding potential from a long-term perspective. It embraces the long-term development needs of the educator, and is a formal, systematic programme designed to promote personal and professional growth. Meanwhile, Swanepoel et al (1998:496) are of the opinion that it is of utmost importance that human resources development should be tailored to fit the organisation's strategy and structure. Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:147) maintain that the educator or staff development programmes must be developed around the particular needs of the individual staff and school situation and should be linked to the vision. The principal should, therefore, know and understand the needs of the individuals and those of the school.

3.2.8 Staff appraisal

Staff appraisal is a very important managerial task of the principal. In many schools, however, formal educator appraisal is neglected or very limited, whereas it is non-existent in others (Squelch & Lemmer, 1994:113). Mothata (2000:11) regards appraisal as a process wherein agreed-upon criteria are used to make judgments or decisions on the quality of effectiveness of a programme, project, thing or set of activities. According to Mothata (2000:11), there are two types of appraisals, namely, judgmental and developmental. Judgmental (summative) refers to those decisions that make judgments and do not necessarily improve anything. Meanwhile, developmental results in development in both the skills and career prospects of the individual educator and leads to improvement at school or institutional level. The developmental approach helps to identify needs and opportunities for growth and development. It builds on the strengths that educators already have (Prinsloo, 2003:211).

The latter is the preferred approach in appraising educators. Naicker and Waddy (2002:60) regard this approach (developmental approach) as an ongoing evaluation designed to provide feedback to the appraisee (the person being appraised) in order to allow that person to improve his/her performance. Meanwhile, judgmental appraisal does not take the educators' interests, values, and opinions etcetera into account. According to Naicker and Waddy (2002:62), judgmental or bureaucratic approach was used in the past and many educators find it not helpful and educators began to resist it. Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:149) point out that because of this approach (judgmental approach) in many schools inspectors were barred from entering the school premises.

Squelch and Lemmer (1994:115) contend that staff appraisal is unpopular with educators because they perceive it as threatening and negative. The principal should, therefore, do his/her best to motivate and persuade the educators to change their attitude towards staff appraisal. He/she should make the educators understand what benefits they (the educators and the school) will get from the staff appraisal system. As Squelch and Lemmer (1994:115) indicate, with careful planning and the correct attitude, staff appraisal can be implemented in a positive and professional way, to the benefit of both the educator and the school in general. Meanwhile, Jones (1993:7-8) lists the following benefits for educators, schools and learners:

Table 3.1 : Benefits of staff appraisal for educators, schools and learners

Staff appraisal should offer educators	Staff appraisal should offer schools	Staff appraisal should offer learners
• recognition for effective practice • greater clarity in role • improved feedback on performance • a more open working environment • better understanding of the requirements of the job • an opportunity to influence policy • a more systematic analysis of training and development needs • greater awareness of career development factors • improved job satisfaction • support in work-related issues	• more accurate information about educator performance • a more purposeful organisation • clear lines of responsibility and communication • a more open ethos and supportive environment • identification and coordination of staff INSET needs • a better informed school • a more accountable organisation • increased staff morale • enrichment of learners	• a clearer understanding by educators of their needs • more systematic planning of learning experiences • curriculum content which is more relevant to their needs at various ages and stages • experience of styles of teaching which make learning a more active process

According to Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:149), it is crucial that appraisal is owned by the educators of the school, that it embraces their educational values, that it reflects the vision and mission of the school, that it is in line with the Provincial and National educational vision, and that it is seen and felt to be part of the professional development of educators rather than the form of control. This implies that educators should have more say in their development. Educators know their strengths and weaknesses and also know in which areas they need more help. As Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:149) indicate, if educators (and other relevant role-players) are involved in the development of criteria for appraisal (relating to the school's vision and stated values, and within broad democratic principles), then they will be far more likely to welcome appraisal as a form of support, rather than fear and resist it as they have done in the past.

3.2.9 Monitoring the implementation of educational policies

According to Van der Westhuizen (1991:151), educational policy is the basis of planning departmental policy, departmental policy forms the basis of school policy and school policy, in turn, forms the basis of classroom policy. The school is where educational policies are put into practice.

Van der Westhuizen (1991:151) is of opinion that the school principal should take note of all levels of policy, as these policy levels would have to be considered in planning action. He/she must ensure that all role-players understand policies and their implications. As Claassen (1999:8) puts it, in schools, the role of the principals is central to an understanding of the processes of policy implementation. Mosoge and Van der Westhuizen (1998:84) agree, arguing that with their wealth of experience, principals are in a good position to know education legislation and rules. This knowledge should be used to guide educators on the parameters of their participation.

Policies formulated at National and Provincial levels pass through education bureaucracies to the complex contexts of schools. Sustaining a reform thrust through these levels is often impossible (Jansen & Christie, 1999:285). Meanwhile, Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:5) maintain that if educators do not implement or use what the policy provides or expects, than that policy needs to be reviewed or the implementation process needs to be examined. Moreover, Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:5) contend that educational policy needs to be developed in such a way that educators have a supportive framework within which they can participate actively in processes of change and development. The principal should, therefore, provide direction to the educators and other individuals in the school. Their activities should be directed, monitored and well managed. This will ensure that daily decisions and actions are consistent with the school's objectives, strategies and values (Anderson & Barker, 1994:11). As Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:4) express it, the success of the implementation of the new policies depends on the meaning that principals and educators can make of these policies and the support they experience during this intense time of educational transformation. This is also true of the policy on whole-school evaluation.

The principal should also ensure that policies formulated at a school level are implemented. Taylor, Rizvi, Lingard and Henry (1997:44) refer to these policies as micro policies. The principal should also ensure that school policies do not conflict with policies formulated at a National and/or Provincial level. School or operational policies should be seen as the extension of National and/or Provincial policies. It is, therefore, important that in planning at school management level, the guidelines of existing government policies should be taken into account (Van der Westhuizen, 1991:150). When planning at school level, the principal should play a leading role not only during the planning stages but also during the implementation stage. Van der Horst and McDonald (2003:4) contend that a process of reform is always difficult for all the people who are involved in the change. Therefore, the principal should always be supportive to everyone in the school so that

the implementation of whatever change becomes successfully implemented. However, the principal cannot be able to provide such support if he/she does not have the necessary information and knowledge of the new policy. Thus, Steyn and Van Niekerk (2002:vii) are of the opinion that principals also require and deserve all the help available to turn the avalanche of reforms into workable practices.

Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:3) maintain that these new policies are designed to create an enabling environment at schools for good teaching and learning. They are designed to shift educational practice to support educators and to ensure that educators are accountable for the work they are doing and to build good management practice at schools. Likewise, Van der Horst and McDonald (2003:4) agree but argue that in South Africa there is a lack of responsibility, dedication and commitment on the part of many educators and learners. The principal has, therefore, a crucial role to play in terms of changing the mindset of the individuals in the school. For many schools and educators, the introduction of so many new policies over a relatively short period of time has proved to be confusing and overwhelming (Davidoff & Lazarus, 2002:4). Therefore, principals are required to provide the necessary support to these individuals in order to boost their morale. Steyn and Van Niekerk (2002:vii) regard this as the time of serious educational management problems and challenges for educational managers in general and for principals in particular.

3.2.10 Monitoring of learner progress

Krug (1992:433) is of the opinion that good principals need to be aware of the variety of ways in which learner progress can and should be assessed. For the principal to be able to monitor the learner progress, he/she should be familiar with the assessment criteria and/or procedures. According to Dreyer (2000:15), assessment criteria identify the kind of evidence that must be gathered in order to be able to report that learners have met a specific outcome. With this knowledge, the principal can, therefore, be able to support the educators in their assessment activities. As Van der Horst and McDonald (1997:12) indicate, assessment is one of an educator's most important activities. Therefore, the principal needs to support the educators in order that they perform this activity effectively. Also, the principal should always monitor that the educators constantly assess the performance of their learners.

Principals as instructional leaders should always concentrate on the improvement and renewal of their learners by monitoring learner progress (Parker & Day, 1997:87). Squelch and Lemmer (1994:13) contend that the frequent monitoring and evaluation of learners' progress and their performance in general and as individuals can contribute to achieving good results. The information obtained can be used to help learners to improve their performance, to provide essential information to educators and to address areas in need of improvement. Likewise, Krug (1992:433) maintains that principals need to use assessment results in ways that help educators and learners to improve and that help parents understand where and why improvement is needed. According to Parker and Day (1997:88), monitoring learner progress includes evaluating learner learning regularly and systematically and using the results to assess the usefulness of the school's goals in achieving the mission. Therefore, results should be used to modify and improve the curriculum design and instructional delivery. Parents should, therefore, always be kept informed about what is happening at school as well as the progress of their children.

3.2.11 Managing curriculum and instruction

The very simple but often neglected principle is that the learners' learning is the supreme reason for the school's existence. Teaching, curriculum, materials, facilities, organisation and administration must then be considered as means, not ends (Drake & Roe, 1999:167). Therefore, the principal should always ensure that the learner learns what he/she is supposed to learn. He/she should also ensure that correct instruction is being used all the time. This can lead to effective teaching and learning in the school. Therefore, the principal should always ensure that both curriculum and instruction are managed. The principal should ensure that effective teaching and learning take place in a school. He/she does this by managing curriculum and instruction. Bailey and Dyck (1990:1) maintain that the principal should work with the educators to improve instruction in order to increase learner achievement.

Effective principals engage in efforts to manage curriculum and instruction, managing with a focus on education-related rather than administrative-related issues. This can be done by providing the knowledge and information, materials and supplies that support the work of educators and staff members as they go about accomplishing the mission of the school (Parker & Day, 1997:86). But managing curriculum and instruction is not always easy for most principals, as they lack the

necessary training and skills. But the principal remains the most important figure in the school and he/she is accountable for everything taking place in the school.

If principals want educators to provide effective instruction in their schools, they (principals) must know what to expect from educators. Krug (1992:432) maintains that effective leaders (principals) provide information that educators need to plan their classes effectively and they actively support curriculum development. Therefore, the principal needs to be aware of the special needs of each instructional area. As Krug (1992:432) put it, without a broad base of knowledge, principals cannot provide the resources that educators and staff need to effectively carry out the school's mission. Blairs (1992:31) regards the following as the activities in which the principal will be involved when exercising leadership in all areas of curriculum evaluation, development and implementation: encouraging team teaching and shared teaching space; facilitating communication and cooperation in planning and implementing classroom programmers, promoting peer support amongst educators and development of ancillary personnel educators' aides, specialist staff, therapists, counselors and student teachers.

3.2.12 Promoting a positive school climate

School climate can help or hinder educators as they attempt to satisfy their needs at work (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993:82). Therefore, a positive school climate should be promoted in order to create an environment that is enabling to both teaching and learning. Squelch and Lemmer (1994:13) maintains that establishing a positive learning culture and environment is also essential for a successful school. This, however, depends largely on the attitude of educators, parents and learners towards learning and education in general. As Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993:84) state, climate provides a reading of how things are going in the school and a basis for predicting school consequences and outcomes. Such a barometer represents an important tool for evaluating present conditions, planning new directions and monitoring progress toward new directions. Thus, the principal has an important role to play not only to promote a positive climate but also to maintain it.

Blairs (1992:31) regards promoting and maintaining a positive school climate as the most demanding facet of the principal's role and one of the most important roles. Likewise, Basson, Van der Westhuizen and Niemann (1991:633) maintain that the school principal as the one in authority is central to the entire activity of creating a climate. He/she should always ensure that good

relationships among the staff, the staff and the learners, the staff and the parents and among the learners are maintained. As Hoy and Miskel (1996:409) show, a climate emerges through the interaction of members and exchange of sentiments among them. The climate of a school is its "personality". According to Basson et al (1991:631), school climate consists of two facets, namely organisational climate and educational climate. Organisational climate is relevant to the educators and is the result of certain factors, from within the management situation that influences the quality of the working life of the educators as well as their perception thereof. Meanwhile, educational climate refers to how learners experience the quality of their working lives as determined by their relationships with their educators. This implies that school climate has a great influence on teaching and learning in the school. Therefore, principals should ensure that this managerial role (promoting a positive school climate) is linked with the reform initiatives like whole-school evaluation and developmental appraisal system for effective teaching and learning to take place (cf 3.3).

There is a strong link between climate and factors that directly effect the quality of teaching and knowing (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993:87). However, Basson et al (1991:634) caution that creating a climate is not a single, isolated action but implies that various other management laws come into effect. To create a school climate where educative teaching comes into its own, the school principal should continually make decisions, solve problems, co-ordinate, delegate, motivate, communicate, evaluate and act correctively. These activities should take place with the necessary grace, attunement and empathy to reflect the good intentions of the school principal.

In conclusion, the principal should ensure that he/she performs these roles effectively so that the school can improve. Clayton (1996:34) contends that with each role comes a different *hat*, a different *set of skills* to deal with the situation. As Davies (1997:1) puts it, the key to full realisation of effective schooling in a reformed and restructured education system depends on the capacity of the leaders (principals) and staff at the school level.

3.3 THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL AND WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION

The principal should perform his/her roles effectively in order for whole-school evaluation to be successfully implemented. As Puri (1996:116) puts it, no system can be effectively implemented unless the people responsible for the system implementation are totally aware of the requirements of the system (cf 2.4). It was stated above that the above managerial role are some of the cardinal

managerial roles that the principal should perform (cf 3.2). The principal should, therefore, be able to link not only the above-mentioned roles but also all other managerial roles with whole-school evaluation so that the school can improve.

According to Van Niekerk (2002:6), one of the key factors influencing school effectiveness is the nature and quality of the leadership and management provided by the school management team, particularly the principal. Good managers make good schools in which the key function of effective teaching and learning is performed well. As Hoberg (1994:44) expresses it, successful schools have principals who are effective goal achievers. Effective principals have a vision of their schools as organisations and of their role in making that vision a reality (Study manual, 1997:5). For the principal to be able to perform his/her roles it is crucial that the principal understands and knows the school holistically. The principal should focus on the big picture and see the school as a whole. Sterling and Davidoff (2000:43) indicate that the school is a living organisation which is made up of many inter-related parts. Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:5-6) add that it is not possible to understand any one part without reference to the interweaving system which sets the constraints and possibilities for the experiences of each part.

Steyn (2002:265) maintains that new conditions and expectations in education can create new challenges and perspectives for the role of the principal. For example, the introduction of whole-school evaluation and other reforms in South African schools demands that the principal should acquire new skills so that he/she would be able to support his/her staff as well as other stakeholders in such a way the objectives of these new developments are realised. With so many important decisions being made at the school level, principals have a crucial role to ensure that these decisions are being implemented (Steyn, 1997:178). For example, for whole-school evaluation to be effectively conducted, principals should always ensure that all staff members not only know and understand their roles but also know and understand roles that principals should play in order for the school to improve. Such roles should be linked to changes taking place in the school setup. For example, the following roles of the principal should be linked to whole-school evaluation as follows:

- Providing leadership. Strong leadership is positively related to staff morale, educators' professional performance and learner learning (Steyn, 1997:178). The principal should, therefore, always provide leadership not only to the staff members but also the other

stakeholders, for example, learners, parents and the community members so that everyone will be determined to achieve the goals of the school. How well educators perform is strongly influenced by their peers, the organisational characteristics and climate of their schools, the professional support they receive, the resources they have available and the learners they teach. Leaders of a school significantly influence all these aspects of the educational process (Hawley, Rosenholtz, Goodstein & Hasselbring, 1984:53). This implies that every member of the staff should be assisted in one way or another for him/her to be able to meet the requirements of the whole-school evaluation.

- Facilitating meaningful change. Du Four and Berkey (1995:2) are of the opinion that the best way for the principal to facilitate meaningful change is by creating conditions which promote the growth and development of the professionals within their schools. Dunlap (1995:147) maintains that in order to prepare learners for an ever-changing world, educators must be given the opportunities to deal with the impact created by these changes. Pretorius (1998:113) concurs and adds that each change should be managed within the unique circumstances of each school and the unique creativity of all staff members.
- Maintaining and developing resources. For whole-school evaluation to be effectively implemented the principal should ensure that the school has all the necessary resources. The implementation of any policy and the provision of education and training are dependent in the final analysis on the availability of resources (Department of Education, 1996:52). As Nias et al (1992:220) put it, no development whether individual or corporate could take place without resources.
- Supervision. Whole-school evaluation can be effectively conducted in a school where activities of all staff members are well supervised. The principal should, therefore, always ensure that he/she knows and understand what each staff member is doing at school. According to Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993:38), supervision is a process designed to help educators and supervisors learn more about their practice, to be better able to use their knowledge and skills to better serve parents and schools and to make the school a more effective learning community.
- Evaluation. According to Wiles and Bondi (2000:173), for most school supervisors (principals), evaluation is an essential tool. Therefore, the principal should constantly evaluate the success of programmes, processes and people. Constant evaluation can help not only the principal but also those that are being evaluated to know if they are fulfilling the school's objectives. Shortcomings can be identified and addressed even before the external evaluators to conduct a whole-school evaluation visit the school. However, Wiles and Bondi (2000:173) maintain that

despite the fact that evaluation is crucial to both school and classroom improvement efforts many educators and principals display a disinterest in evaluation.

- Building and maintaining a winning team. Foriska (1994:31) maintains that the key to the principalship is getting things done through teamwork – especially when dealing with student learning. The principals' efforts to improve learner achievement are more successful if they are directed at helping educators help learners learn. A winning team can be able, for example, to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the school during the internal evaluation and then try to work on the weaknesses as a team before the external evaluation. As Pretorius (1998:106) puts it, a true culture of teamwork and team spirit is essential to the successful functioning of the school organisation. All members of the team are jointly responsible for the successful accomplishment of the school's goals.
- Developing human resources. Human capacity and development form the central aspect of whole-school evaluation (Department of Education, 2001b:10). Whole-school evaluation is conducted in order to, among the other things; identify areas where the staff needs assistance. For the school to develop, human capacity and development should be addressed. Pre-service and in-service training are an essential and integral component of preparing for the whole-school evaluation (Department of Education, 2001b:10).
- Staff appraisal. Appraisal promotes quality by monitoring and improving the effectiveness of each individual educator and therefore of the staff as a whole (Goddard & Emerson, 1992:3). Steyn (2002:279) maintains that putting the appraisal scheme into action is the responsibility of senior management and as such it should be perceived as an integral part of management practice.
- Monitoring the implementation of educational policies. The powers of ensuring that the school functions effectively are delegated to the principal, so the principal should monitor the implementation of educational policies.
- Monitoring of learner progress. The very simple but often neglected principle is that the learners' learning is the supreme reason for the school's existence (Drake & Roe, 1999:167). According to Hawley et al (1984: 54), the things principals do that contribute most to learners' achievement can be grouped into the following four general categories of activity that interrelated: identify, develop consensus about and reinforce goals; ensure the capabilities of educators and support staffs; create conditions that facilitate teaching and learning; and motivate educators and supporting personnel fully to utilise their capabilities. The principal should have

mechanisms in place for monitoring the learner progress because whole-school evaluation is about what is happening inside and outside the classroom.

- Managing curriculum and instruction. Intellectually challenging teaching is characterised by an appropriate curriculum, planning, problem solving, enough time allowed for engaging in academic tasks, frequently monitored homework, maximum communication and the use of a variety of instructional skills and strategies (Steyn, 1997:178).
- Promoting a positive school climate. Whole-school evaluation can take place in a school where there is a positive climate. The principal should, therefore, promote and maintain a positive school climate. Drake and Roe (1999:131), however, argue that positive results may be subject to the observer and positive results may not be viewed the same over time.

3.4 SCHOOLING IN DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS/COMMUNITIES

The schooling system of a country includes many different institutions for education and training which strive to meet the diverse needs of learners. In accordance with the learners' ages and development stages, there are preprimary schools, primary or elementary schools, secondary schools and institutions for higher education such as universities and technikons (Van Wyk, 1999b:70). According to Fataar (1997:74), the existing pattern of provision of schooling in South Africa is the outcome of a history of colonialism, segregation and apartheid. From the earliest times education was configured along race, class and geographic lines. Van Wyk (1999b:79-80) maintains that schools situated in a particular district or area often reflect the characteristics of the area. This frequently necessitates coping with the problems of the communities these schools serve. Most disadvantaged schools are situated in black areas and they cater for the educational needs of the black communities that, in most cases, are also disadvantaged. Natriello, McDill and Pallas (1990:1) contend that the problems of disadvantaged learners are the result of long-term conditions that are not susceptible to short-term solutions. In South Africa, a number of reforms have been introduced to address the problems faced by the disadvantaged schools and/or learners. As a result whole-school evaluation as one of these reforms takes the context of the school into consideration.

Disadvantaged schools in developing countries serve the majority group of the population, whereas in developed countries disadvantaged schools serve the minority group of the population. Previously, the South African education system was divided according to race and each race group had its own education administration. This divided system led to gross inequalities in the per capita

funding of education with black education provision the most under-developed and poorly resourced. Although attempts are being made to address the disparities of the past, the gap between the previously advantaged and disadvantaged schools still exist. Fataar (1997:79) notes that there are also regional disparities and suggests that those Provinces that are underprivileged should be prioritised in the provision of schooling. As Van Wyk and Mothata (1998:4) find, some learners attend schools which are well developed and resourced, while many others are still being taught in schools which are comparable with the worst in Africa. This has a negative bearing on the implementation of the new policies, including whole-school evaluation by the disadvantaged schools. Without resources or with limited resources schools can struggle to implement the changes being introduced in the education system in South Africa.

Schools found within rural areas differ from those found in urban areas (Van Wyk, 1999b:80). But in the past, blacks in South Africa received inferior education whether they were in urban or rural areas. Møller (1995:89) regards the crisis in black education as a legacy of the past. According to Mothata (2000:77), that is why the principle of redress of past inequalities is one of the major principles of the new education dispensation. As a result, South African schools have become sites of radical change (Squelch & Lemmer, 1994:vii). In spite of these radical changes in the education system, there is still no effective schooling in most disadvantaged schools which happen to serve disadvantaged communities. Fataar (1997:71) argues that with more money allocated to the qualitative expansion of black schooling, less money was available for white schooling. As a result well-resourced white schools with parent communities that could afford to pay exorbitant school fees were, thus, enabled by state to preserve a privileged schooling system. But Greenwald, Hedges and Laine (1996:361) argue that it has proven difficult to determine the relation between school expenditures (the things money may buy) and learner achievement. Likewise, Slavin (1999:519) maintains that although funding equalisation provides a real opportunity for poor schools to improve themselves, there is no guarantee that learners actually benefit. As Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:4) put it, a new political and educational dispensation has as yet meant very little change on the ground.

Even though education is the largest area of expenditure in the South African state budget and whilst compared to other middle-income countries, the government's expenditure on education is high; the quality of schooling in South Africa is believed to be relatively poor (Seekings, 2002:1). Poor schooling is more evident in most disadvantaged schools. For Hillman (1996:3) disadvantage

both limits access to educational opportunities and reduces the ability of learners to benefit from the schooling that they do get. But Slavin (1999:522) is of the opinion that if money can be spent on specific programmes or other investments known to be effective, it can make a difference in improving quality of education in disadvantaged schools.

A multiple of factors may account for the school problems of poor children (Miller-Lachmann & Taylor, 1995:72). Hillman (1996:3-4) lists a number of contributory factors. According to Hillman (1996:4), not only do these factors accumulate but they also reinforce one another so that their collective impact is even greater than the sum of the individual effects. But (Miller-Lachmann & Taylor, 1995:72) regard the following three factors as having a major impact on determining the nature of education that learners from disadvantaged areas can acquire:

- **Economic factors**

The ability of countries to provide schooling for all depends on the economic condition of the country (Fataar, 1997:82). Fataar (1997:82) argues that the developing countries that are unable to stimulate economic growth and alleviate conditions of poverty would more than likely not be able to address their citizen's schooling needs. Likewise, Miller-Lachmann and Taylor (1995:72) contend that growing up in poverty is considered to be one of the main risk factors for low achievement and dropping out of school. In fact, economic status and educational achievement are significantly linked (Natriello et al, 1990:21). Coutts (1995:73) argues that learners that come from economically deprived communities seldom have experienced the rich range of books, toys, television and travel that are taken for granted by the more affluent sectors of the schooling population.

According to Coutts (1995:72), since so much brain growth occurs during the early years of life, great numbers of learners from poverty-stricken areas enter school educationally deprived and disadvantaged. Walker (2003:74) is of the opinion that learners who come from poverty areas are likely to suffer from health and other social-related problems. Maeroff (1998:2) argues that if the problems of learners from poor areas are not addressed the grinding poverty in which these learners live and the deprivations it produces will continue to block their scholastic achievement regardless of the quality of their education. Halle, Kurtz-Costes and Mahoney (1997:527) concur, arguing that because poor learners are less likely to pursue higher education it is difficultly for them to break out

of the cycle of poverty. This can, to some extent, be overcome by creating a kind of community school that addresses health, social and recreational needs as well as offering extended time for academics for these learners. This means, trying to improve conditions in the neighbourhood itself (Maeroff, 1998:3). Likewise, Barberton, Blake and Kotzé (1998:28) argue that if a learner is hungry he/she cannot concentrate properly at school. Therefore, schools should come to the aid of the learner. For example, in South Africa a number of disadvantaged schools have been included in a feeding scheme programme. The Department of Education has introduced a system whereby learners at lower classes are given food at school during their break times. This scheme intends to ensure that learners from disadvantaged areas have something in their stomachs in order to ensure that they then concentrate on their education. But so far this scheme accommodates only primary school learners, leaving out the secondary school learners. Thus, the problem of learners who come to school hungry is only partially addressed.

However, Natriello, et al (1990:21) argue that although there is a moderately strong association between poverty status and performance on standardised tests, there has been no direct evidence to support this contention. As a result a number of studies have moved beyond economic status as the sole determinant by documenting specific family behaviours and practices that correlate with higher learner achievement (Chrispeels, 1996:300).

- **Home environment factors**

According to Chrispeels (1996:306), families living in low-income communities are likely to live in unsafe neighbourhoods. These families have less access to home and community learning opportunities. Thus, the environment of the disadvantaged children because of its nature has a negative impact on their schooling. Miller-Lachmann and Taylor (1995:72) maintain that even before children are born their mothers are less likely to receive pre-natal care as a result a larger percentage of these children suffers learning and other disabilities that impede their school success. Miller-Lachmann and Taylor, (1995:72) go on to say that these children are more likely to spend their early years in crowded, substandard housing with few books and toys to provide intellectual stimulation.

Lemmer (1995:92) maintains that there is frequently a lack of books, magazines and newspapers, educational radio and television in the home and communicative styles are practised which are not

consonant with those in the school. According to Lemmer (1995:92-93), this kind of dissonance between home and school further diminishes the chances of school success. Meanwhile, Natriello et al (1990:24) maintain that mother's characteristics are especially important in structuring the educational environment in the home. Mothers who are more highly educated themselves have more knowledge of their children's schooling, have more social contact with school personnel and are better managers of their children's academic careers. Thus, children of highly educated mothers do better in school and stay in school longer than children whose parents have not completed high school. Also, children of poorly educated mothers score lower on standardised tests than children whose parents obtained higher levels of schooling (Natriello et al, 1990:24). Hillman (1996:4) concurs and argues that parents who have lower levels of education, poor parenting and educating skills are less likely to have knowledge about and confidence in the education system. Likewise, the school success of a child from an intact family of middle-class background is enhanced by adults who help the child understand and interpret classroom events by spending the early years of childhood introducing their children to school-like experiences (Lemmer, 1992:92). But children from disadvantaged areas often do not have this privilege, as their parents are constrained by their own educational and socio-economic backgrounds.

- **Cultural factors**

Racial/ethnic grouping is perhaps the best-known factor associated with the educationally disadvantaged (Natriello et al, 1990). Likewise, Khattri et al (1997:87) contend that ethnicity is often cited as a factor that put learners at risk for educational failure. Cultures tend to use explanations for success and failure (Triandis, 1994:133). Therefore, culture should be taken as one of the important factors that determine the learner achievement in the school.

According to Triandis (1994:15), culture influences the way humans select, interpret, process and use information. Van der Horst and McDonald (2003:55) concur and maintain that culture expresses itself through the arts and ways of living, behaviour patterns, heritage, knowledge and belief systems. As a result Van Heerden (1997:197) is of the opinion that the entire process of education, learning and teaching is influenced and shaped by culture but in turn is transmitted and preserved by education. Lemmer and Squelch (1993:12) regard this as a dual relationship between education and culture. Therefore, educators should take the influence of culture on schooling into account in order to ensure that effective teaching and learning takes place in the school. Lemmer

and Squelch are of the opinion that failure to take cognisance of cultural factors may lead to, *inter alia*: cultural isolation, cultural erosion, learning problems, behavioural problems et cetera.

Van Niekerk (1999:18) contends that the history of ethnically based education systems in South Africa has resulted in inequalities, backlogs and imbalances regarding both human and financial resources. Thus, the culture of the society should not be looked down upon when formulating educational policies. Lemmer and Squelch (1993:140) contend that research suggests that the way in which an individual learns is closely associated with culture. Thus, not all learners learn in the same way. As a result studies have been conducted in the United States of America and other countries to investigate cultural differences and how these influence teaching and learning in order to improve the provision of education (Van Heerden, 1997:199).

3.4.1 Parent participation in disadvantaged schools

Parent participation in an education system is essential because parents should support learning at home. Chrispeels (1996:302-303) maintains that parent involvement have benefits for all involved, namely learners, parents and educators. In addition to improved academic performance, these benefits include: improved learner attitudes, conduct and attendance; improved classroom performance when parents tutored learners; better understanding of learner needs by both parents and educators, increases self-confidence and personal satisfaction for particular parents; active parental support of instructional programmes and augmented instructional resources.

According to Squelch and Lemmer (1994:93), benefits of parent involvement include improved school performance, reduced dropout rates, a decrease in delinquency and a more positive attitude towards the school. Mothata (2000:123), however, warns that parent involvement should not be seen as merely attending school meetings whenever parents are invited or whenever there is a crisis as is the case in some areas, especially in townships schools. Vally and Spreen (1998:14) agree with this argument adding that there is a lack of parent support in most disadvantaged schools. This impacts negatively on teaching and learning in these schools. Chrispeels (1996:302) is of the opinion that the various ways that parents and schools interact can be divided into the following five major categories: involvement in shared governance on mandated advisory committees; communication between school and home with most communications coming from the school; parental support for the school in the form of fundraising, helping with field trips or attending

school events; participation with educators in the classroom and provision of parents' education activities. Pretorius (1999:161) adds that the most important matter is the role parents play in supporting learners' own work at home, especially with regard to homework, additional learning opportunities, the creation of a culture of learning at home, setting an example as lifelong learners and the encouragement of additional reading. For Haynes and Comer (1996:503) this is not always possible with parents of learners in disadvantaged schools as these parents sometimes avoid schools because they feel inadequate, unwelcome, threatened or insecure due to their own past educational experiences and children's present difficulties.

Jantjes (1995:289-290) maintains that the lack of equity in education in South Africa created by the legacy of apartheid has crippled the quality of life of the past disenfranchised and marginalised population, particularly with regard to home environment that lack the educational resources to meet children's educational needs adequately. However, Jantjes (1995:290) argues that it is possible for educators to create a breakthrough for learners from such disadvantaged homes. Including parents as important members of the educational process can do this. However, this is not always possible as most parents in these areas (disadvantaged areas) have a problem of their own disadvantaged educational background (Mazibuko, 2003:3). As Muijs et al (2004:164) put it; achieving parental involvement is one of the most difficult areas of school improvement in economically deprived areas. According to Muijs et al (2004:164), one large-scale study found that children in high socio-economic status (SES) homes were subject to only half as much parental talk as children in high SES families, with talk aimed at them more likely to be negative than in high SES family. For parents to be actively involved in the education of their children, they need educational programmes so that they will know what is required of them.

Schools should help parents provide better educational environments at home for their children. Parents, particularly those of the children in disadvantaged schools should also be helped to understand the curriculum of the school, what standards of achievement are expected from their children and what parents should do at home to improve their children's achievement and the quality of the school. Haynes and Comer (1996:503) contend that at home, parents should provide the nurturing, support and reinforcement necessary to strengthen the bond between home and school and to increase chances of success for their children. Meanwhile, Miller-Lachmann and Taylor (1995:374) are of the opinion that it is essential for the school to reach out and establish an alliance with the community. Pretorius (1999:169) maintains that the community as a whole must

accept the shared responsibility for educating children. Therefore, community leaders and community organisations should work cooperatively with schools to build bridges between communities in deprived areas and the schools.

These are, however, not always possible as most of these families often lack the human and material resources needed for a positive academic achievement in the house. The educational level of most parents from the disadvantaged communities can also restrict these parents from assisting their children with their schoolwork. For example, parents who do not speak English may be severely hampered in their ability to help their children with their schoolwork or in their ability to manage their children's school career (Natriello et al (1990:26).

3.4.2 The influence of the disadvantaged family on the learner performance

A number of theories have attempted to explain how the family structure or community influences the learner performance. The type of family that the child comes from may have a positive or negative influence on the development and school achievement of the child. Khattri et al (1997:88) are of the opinion that parents' own educational experiences also shape the expectations they themselves hold on their children. These expectations are, therefore, amongst the factors that determine how well the child (learner) performs in school. Halle et al (1997:527) point out that children from higher socio-economic status backgrounds score higher on standardised achievement tests, are more likely to finish high school and are more likely to attend college and postgraduate education than their less advantaged peers.

According to Hillman (1996:3), socio-economic and family background factors have been shown to be important influences upon learners' educational achievements at all stages of their school careers. These factors are strongly related to measures of prior attainment at entry to school. However, Chrispeels (1996:301) argues that research shows that socio-economic status is not as important as family values, attitudes, educational aspirations and cultural factors that influence family practices in regard to children's education. Halle et al (1997:527) concur, arguing that although economic hardship and social discrimination provide difficult obstacles to overcome, parents' behaviours, beliefs, attitudes, goals and lifestyles may circumvent the detrimental effects of poverty, thereby fostering not only achievement striving but also academic success in some disadvantaged children. Thus, some learners succeed in spite of their difficult background or

circumstances. As Clark, Zimmerman and Arunkumar (in Halle et al, 1997:527) point out; many disadvantaged parents both of minority and majority ethnic groups are successful in translating their high academic aspirations for their children into reality.

Barberton et al (1998:28) are of the opinion that a learner from a disadvantaged home may be affected in the following manner: some children from poor households are kept out of school to help with domestic tasks; others take the burden of poverty to school with them, if his/her home has no electricity no proper study can be done in the evening and if the child assumes domestic roles of cooking, cleaning and child-care, this leaves less time for homework.

Chrispeels; Teddlie, Stringfield and Reynolds (in Muijs et al, 2004:152) are of the opinion that the compensatory model may be used in order to assist learners from the disadvantaged areas. This model states that because of the problems faced by learners in disadvantaged areas the school needs to compensate the lack of resources in the learners' homes. However, this is not always possible, as Halle et al (1997:535) point out, not only do these children (learners) come from economically disadvantaged home environments but their school environments are also typically inferior (disadvantaged) to those of better-off peers. Thus, the school may find it difficult to assist learners from disadvantaged homes in order to cope with their problems because the school has problems of its own. For example, most disadvantaged schools have limited resources.

3.4.3 Barriers to quality education in disadvantaged schools/communities

According to Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana (2004:4), a barrier to learning is any factor, either internal or external to the learner that causes a hindrance or *barrier* to that person's ability to benefit from schooling. Prinsloo (2005:27) concurs and regards a barrier as an obstacle or circumstance that keeps people or things apart. It prevents communication and bars access to advancement. Thus, if barriers are not addressed they can add to the problems already experienced by schools in general and disadvantaged schools in particular. This can have a direct impact on the quality of education that should be provided by the individual school. However, Relic (s.a.:4) argues that quality in education changes over time in response to changes in society.

Thus, all aspects of education should be regarded as important and quality in education should not be judged from any narrow perspective (Killen, 1999:1). In South Africa quality procedures in the

past were characterised by differentiated top-down quality controls (Lemmer, 1998a:117). Lemmer (1998a:117) goes on to say that school inspections, in particular, were regarded as intrusive and bureaucratic and also acted as a means of implementing apartheid education in black schooling. Likewise, Møller (1995:90) maintains that in South Africa, black school children as well as the older generations have borne the brunt of apartheid. Thus far, inequalities of the past have not been completely eliminated and these inequalities still provide barriers to quality education in disadvantaged schools and/or communities. Both issues inside and outside the school can cause barriers to quality education. According to Aitken (1996:8), studies undertaken by the Education Review Office in New Zealand schools reveal that barriers to learning include those that originate outside the school (extra-school), those that originate from national administrative arrangements (inter-school) and those that originate within each school (intra-school). Barriers to learning are more prevalent to disadvantaged schools/communities.

Barriers can be located within the learner, within the center of learning, within the education system and within the broader social, economic and political context. These barriers manifest themselves in different ways and only become obvious when learning breakdown occurs, when learners *drop out* of the system or when the excluded become visible (Department of Education, 1997:12). Van Wyk and Mothata (1998:4) and Chisholm (2000:4) regard the following as some of the barriers that still hamper the disadvantaged schools: poor infrastructure, overcrowding, inadequate classrooms, under-qualified educators and an absence of the technologies of teaching including educational resources such as textbooks, exercise books, pens and pencils (c.f 1.2). Likewise, Jarvis, Meek and Shepherd (1995:132) agree that there is a severe shortage of facilities in the majority of the country's schools. According to Jarvis et al (1995:132), most of these schools do not have libraries (or if they do, they are only thinly stocked with worthwhile, up-to-date books) and few have science laboratories, adequate sports facilities, halls or staff rooms. Toilet facilities are generally insufficient, while electricity and running water are often unavailable. Most of these schools if not all, serve the disadvantaged black communities. This shows that disadvantaged schools face enormous difficulties which impact negatively on teaching and learning.

Of all the inequalities, the one that disadvantages learners most directly is overcrowded classrooms (Jarvis et al, 1995:132). According to Jarvis et al (1995:132), learners in these schools (disadvantaged schools) are crushed together on inadequate seating, often have no writing surfaces and take turns to use available books and materials. If these disadvantaged schools are to provide

quality education, these barriers need to be addressed. As Aitken (1996:12) puts it, if schools are to meet their responsibility to educate, the barriers to learning faced by learners cannot be ignored. Schools have no option but to accept a responsibility which is not their core business and which places stress on resources and workload.

3.5 CONTEXTUAL FACTORS IMPACTING ON LEARNER SUCCESS

There are a number of issues within schools and classrooms which are universally recognised as influencing education (Van Wyk, 1999b:83). Vandenbergh (1992:32) maintains that the internal functioning of a school is determined by many known and unknown factors. These issues, in most cases, determine the manner in which teaching and learning take place in the classrooms in a particular school. For example, they have an impact on the implementation of the new policies or initiatives being introduced in South Africa. As a result these factors have an influence on whether the implementation of whole-school evaluation and other initiatives will be successfully implemented in different schools. According to Department of Education (1997:14), such factors either impact negatively on the learner or on his/her family community and this has an impact on what is taking place in the classroom. As Kruger and Van Schalkwyk (1997:4) put it, the success and effectiveness of a school and education system are determined by what takes place in the classrooms or the learning groups.

Effective learning is directly related to and dependent on the social and emotional well being of the learner. It is important to recognise that particular conditions may arise within the social, economic and political environment in which the learner lives which impact negatively on the learner's social and emotional well-being, thus, placing the learner at risk of learning breakdown (Department of Education, 1997:14). But schools are unique so are their needs, demands, problems, challenges and other issues affecting them (Squelch & Lemmer, 1994:23). Thus, because of their uniqueness different schools respond differently to the demands and other issues that are placed upon them. For instance, South Africa has a population consisting of both developed and developing communities; hence its educational system has its own unique problems ((Grober, Campher, Du Preez, Loock & Shaba, 2002:13). The following are some of the major issues that affect the disadvantaged schools:

3.5.1 Lack of infrastructure

Infrastructure usually refers to the basic conditions under which teaching and learning takes place, the school and classroom environment (Department of Education, 1996b:48). For effective teaching and learning to take place there should be favourable conditions. But Vakalisa (2000:24) maintains that in most schools in townships and rural areas, where learners are Africans and/or blacks, conditions are still not conducive for effective teaching and learning. This has a negative effect on both the educators and learners in disadvantaged schools. As a result parents who can afford financially have decided to take their children to the advantaged schools. Vakalisa (2000:24) contends that children from poor families remain behind and have no chance of avoiding scantily equipped schools.

Many disadvantaged schools in South Africa do not have even basic needs like running water, decent toilets and electricity. Although, the African National Congress (1995:14) recommended almost ten years ago that the need for more and better school buildings and other education and training facilities should be addressed as a matter of urgency, this has not yet been fulfilled. As a result the majority of learners in a number of disadvantaged schools in South Africa still learn under appalling conditions. For Mead (2005:1) lack of adequate school buildings in American schools hampers some of most promising and innovative reform efforts. Moreover, dilapidated school facilities send a wrong message to learners about the priority that is often placed on their education. Therefore, the issue of infrastructure and other resources needs to be addressed speedily so that high quality education can be offered in disadvantaged schools as well. Mead (2005:2) is of the opinion that disparities in facilities send disadvantaged learners a visible and unmistakable message that there is less care about their education than that of their more affluent peers.

Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:31) are of the opinion that the school facilities need to promote rather than hinder the teaching and learning for both educators and learners. At the level of access, the school grounds, buildings and classrooms need to be accessible to all learners (including learners with disabilities who may require specifications that facilitate their access), safe (in terms of the physical and psychological environment) and conducive to effective teaching and learning. No school can be effective without the necessary facilities. Thus, in order to perform adequately within the context set by national policy and legislation, all school and management structures require basic infrastructures (Department of Education, 1996b:68).

3.5.2 Limited proficiency in the medium of instruction

Learners whose primary language is not English or who have limited English proficiency face special obstacles to success in school (Natriello et al, 1990:25). This is one of the problems faced by most learners in disadvantaged schools as they, in most cases, use the language that is not their mother tongue as a medium of instruction. These learners are, as Khattri, Riley and Kane (1997:89) suggest, at risk of educational failure due to the classroom challenges they face. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that most of the time, there are no programmes readily available to support learners in disadvantaged schools to master the language that is foreign to them. Natriello et al (1990:26) are of the opinion that parents who do not speak the language used as a medium of instruction may be severely hampered in their ability to help their children with their schoolwork or in their ability to manage their children's school career.

In South Africa, English is used as a language of instruction as from grade four in all disadvantaged schools. According to Lemmer (1995:83), a preference for English as the medium of instruction is the result of strong pragmatic incentives because of the socio-economic mobility associated with the language and its traditional place in commerce. But the majority of these learners battle with English Second Language communication related activities because they are not proficient in English (Schlebusch & Thobedi, 2004:36). The inability of these learners to use English affects their academic performance. What compounds the problem is that most of their educators are also not proficient in English as they use it as a Second Language. As Lemmer (1995:88) puts it, educators themselves lack the English proficiency necessary for effective teaching. Furthermore, educators are not equipped with principles of language acquisition and thus educators seldom have the knowledge and skills to support English language learning and/or to teach literacy skills across the entire curriculum. As a result mastering the language becomes a mammoth task for learners in disadvantaged schools. Schlebusch and Thobedi (2004:47) are of the opinion that the fact that English is mainly used inside not outside the classroom puts learners in disadvantaged schools at a disadvantage as they do not have time to practice the language at an informal level.

Meanwhile, Lemmer (1995:92) explains that some learners in disadvantaged schools in South Africa may also speak other languages beside their mother tongue and English may reveal various English language disorders because of the interference of other languages in the production and

understanding of Standard English. This hampers these learners' competency in English (Schlebusch & Thobedi 2004:36).

3.5.3 Overcrowding

According to Samuel (1990:20), inadequate teaching in the disadvantaged schools is made even more difficult by appalling overcrowded conditions. Van Wyk (1999b:83) concurs that few issues rouse stronger feelings among educators than class size, and few have more direct implications for school policy and practice. Educators believe that the quality of their teaching and their interactions with learners decline with an increase in the size of the class. Overcrowding, thus, makes it difficult for educators to pay individual attention to their learners. According to Human Rights Watch (2001:31), there is still a chronic shortage of classrooms in black schools and learner-educator ratios remain unacceptably high. Although there has been a significant improvement in the ratios and a number of new classrooms have been built over the past few years, disparities still exist.

Learner-educator ratios are a contentious issue since it is clearly important that an educator should not be responsible for unmanageable large number of learners. Awareness is necessary, however, that reducing learner-educator ratios to levels that previously prevailed in white education would increase the costs of education restructuring to unaffordable levels (Schwabe et al, 1996:48). Van Wyk (1999b:83) estimates that a decrease in class size will on the other hand increase per-learner costs by approximately 25%. Van Wyk (1999b:83) adds that while educators teaching smaller groups of learners are more likely to feel satisfied with their job and believe that they are doing a better work, in reality their teaching may not change and nor are learners' attitude toward school likely to change. According to Lemmer (1998b:41), research based on classroom observations shows that there are not necessarily more personal interactions between educators and learners in smaller group.

In developing countries educators often have to cope with extremely large classes (Van Wyk, 1999b:83). It is in the developing countries where most disadvantaged schools and/or communities are found. Large classes often impact negatively on teaching and learning in the disadvantaged schools. Lemmer (1998b:41) is of the opinion that since it is unlikely for the majority disadvantaged schools in South Africa to reduce class size due by hiring additional educators due to budgetary constraints, educators should be equipped with knowledge and understanding of the

dynamics of group processes and develop skills and strategies for teaching effectively in large classes.

3.5.4 Discipline problems

Discipline is essential for maintaining order and harmony in a school and for providing a climate in which learners can learn and educators can teach free from disruption and chaos (Squelch & Lemmer, 1994:40). In some cases this discipline has little effect, while other schools have effective discipline (Janson, 1996:88). Thus, some schools operate in an orderly and conducive environment while others operate in a disorderly and chaotic environment. Accordingly, Squelch and Lemmer (1994:40) maintain that nowadays principals and educators have to deal with a wide variety of discipline problems and misbehaviour which are compounded by various social factors, such as violence, drug and alcohol abuse, family disintegration and poverty. All these factors play an important role in determining and influencing learners' behaviour and attitudes. Therefore, schools should have mechanisms in place to deal with discipline problems.

According to Wright (1993:3), the problem of discipline arises when learners apparently deliberately set about frustrating educators from the task for which they are employed. They do this by, among the other things, being inattentive, covertly or overtly disruptive of other learners, disobedient, rude and threaten to push the situation out of the educator's control. As a result a number of educators are leaving the profession because they are tired of dealing with discipline problems (Van Wyk, 1999b:89). Halle et al (1997:535) maintain that disadvantaged schools are more likely to have more discipline problems and few learners who place priority on learning. Likewise, Muijs et al (2004:150) concur that disadvantaged schools or schools in disadvantaged areas often face pressures such as challenging learner behaviour, high level of staff turnover and poor physical environment. This really lowers the morale of educators and adversely affects teaching and learning in these schools. No effective teaching and learning can take place in a school where educators have a low morale, where discipline problems are the order of the day and where there is chaos. As Jansen (1996:89) puts it, in schools without order and discipline, there is very little cooperation between learners and educators. This should not be the case, as this can impact negatively on the culture of teaching and learning. As Lemmer (1998b:38) puts it, effective teaching and learning depends largely on the establishment of a sound relationship between the educators and the learners in a classroom. Therefore, all educators need to establish good personal

relationships with their classes, ideally on an individual basis with each of the learners, as well as on a whole class or large group basis. This can help to minimise discipline problems that are experienced in schools, particularly disadvantaged schools.

According to Lemmer (1998b:46), misbehaviour (discipline problem), whether by group or individual can range from mild forms such as tardiness, failure to complete homework satisfactory, loud talking an mild verbal aggression, to severe misbehaviour that includes violence, vandalism, intimidation, sexual misconduct, theft and abuse of drugs and alcohol. Likewise, Charles (1999:2-3) maintains that the misbehaviour that troubles educators' classrooms is usually much less serious: goofing off, talking and inattention, for example, relatively innocuous behaviours that nevertheless waste much instructional time and interfere with learning. These behaviours are experienced, particularly in the disadvantaged schools worldwide and they disrupt the school in one-way or another. Meanwhile, Miller-Lachmann and Taylor (1995:102) using African-American boys as an example, maintain that the brightest and most assertive boys are also the most likely to be identified with discipline problems. Charles (1999:6) contends that misbehaviour of whatever form prevents educators from teaching well and helping learners to learn effectively. Therefore, misbehavours or discipline problems should be managed. As Hollin (1993:80) puts it, bad behaviour in school is not to anyone's advantage and therefore must be managed.

Muijs et al, (2004:151) are of the opinion that different improvement strategies are required for schools in difficult or challenging circumstances than for those in more advantaged circumstances. Hollin (1993:80) is of the opinion that whether implicit or explicit, the management techniques that should be employed in dealing with misbehaviour should depend on the way in which the bad behaviour is understood, that is, either by focusing on the learner or by focusing on the environment or both. When dealing with the learner who misbehaves, the educator should be very careful not to exacerbate the problem. Therefore, an educator who is confronted by such behaviours should stay calm and avoid overreaction. The cause/s of the incident/problem should also be established in order to prevent it from recurring. Sometimes educators can help these learners by being good listeners and by encouraging them to consider alternate ways to solve problems or to adapt to difficult situations. However, Squelch and Lemmer (1994:44) point out that there is no easy recipe for dealing with discipline. Each school is unique and for this reason it is important for the school to analyse its particular situation and determine its own needs and approaches.

3.5.5 Criminal incidents

Criminal incidents include burglaries, assaults, stabbings, rapes and other serious crimes (Department of Education, 2001a:77). Van Wyk (1999b:89) is of the opinion that criminal incidents taking place at schools mirror the violence of the society which shapes the schools. Some learners growing up in a violent society tend to perceive violence as a legitimate vehicle for conflict resolution. According to Van Wyk (1999b:89), crime and violence are prevalent in and around many schools across the world. One of the most significant challenges to learning for many learners is the threat of violence at school (Human Rights Watch, 2001:32). Learners attending disadvantaged schools are more vulnerable to criminal activities than their counterparts attending advantaged schools.

Van Wyk (1999b:89) argues that the issue is not the degree of school crime but rather the impact it has on the quality of learners' education. Van Wyk (1999b:89) also argues that learners miss school because they fear for their personal safety. Likewise, Miller-Lachmann and Taylor (1995:74) maintain that a school that is physically unsafe, that suffers vandalism and violence against educators and learners and that features constant disruptions interrupting class time is a difficult place in which to learn. This impedes the progress of many children that come from the disadvantaged areas/communities. The Human Rights Watch (2001:33) regards violence as a form of criminal activity that emanates from a variety of sources. For example, violence may be perpetrated by educators, by learners and even by strangers to the school community.

The nature of the center of learning and its ability to provide a conducive teaching and learning environment is undermined when high levels of violence and crime make the surrounding environment unsafe. When the safety of educators and learners cannot be guaranteed learners may be prevented from participating in effective teaching and learning or these may be disrupted (Department of Education, 1997:14). Like in most part of the world, criminal incidents and violence are witnessed in most schools in South Africa. As Van Wyk (1999b:90) puts it, violence is not unknown to South African youth. The Department of Education (2001a:77) points out that a total of 35.6% of schools nationwide (South Africa) reported criminal incidents in their schools in 1999. However, there are no data systems to facilitate the evaluation of crime statistics on the basis of where the crime was committed (Human Rights Watch, 2001:33). Although it is not indicated

whether these incidents took place in advantaged or disadvantaged schools, it is more than likely that most of them took place in the disadvantaged schools.

According to the United States Department of Education (in Miller-Lachmann and Taylor (1995:74), learners in high poverty schools identified their schools as having problems of weapons possession, vandalism, fights among learners and physical and verbal attacks against educators approximately 50% more often than learners in low poverty schools. Obviously, no effective teaching and learning can take place under these conditions. As Van Wyk (1999b:89) suggests, education quality diminishes in a climate of violence and fear. Therefore, schools, particularly disadvantaged schools should be made crime-free institutions so that there can be effective teaching and learning. Human Rights Watch (2001:3) states that schools should be safe havens for learning. Unfortunately, too many schools are not safe and girls in particular are at high risk of being victimised.

3.5.6 School dropouts

A number of children of school-going age are not at school (Fataar, 1997:72). Most of these children are from the poor or disadvantaged communities. As Natriello et al (1990:21) put it, children from poor families are more likely to drop out of high school. A number of factors force learners from disadvantaged schools and/or communities to leave schools before graduation (drop out of school). Van Wyk (1999b:85) maintains that learners either drop out or pushed out of school. The term *dropout* puts inordinate blame on the individual, while the term *pushout* puts blame on the institution. This implies that a learner can leave the school because he/she cannot cope up with what is taking place in the school or because the learner feels rejected by the school (that is, educators and/or other fellow learners). Van Wyk (1999b:86-88) lists a number of key variables that can help to explain why certain learners are at risk of dropping out of school:

Socio-economic status is regarded as one of the variables that have an influence on the learner dropout. According to Van Wyk (1999b:86), children living in poverty are less likely to complete school. Some families cannot afford to pay for school fees, books and supplies transportation and uniforms. Halle et al (1997:527) using the United States as an example maintain that low-income African American children are at least twice as likely to drop out of school than their more advantaged White peers. Likewise, Christie (1997:112) concurs and maintains that though

increasing numbers of learners are progressing through to the end of senior secondary education, there are still marked racial differences in dropout and repeater rates in South African schools. So far, there are still comparatively high dropout and repeater rates, particularly in black schools. But Halle et al (1997:534) argue that learners from disadvantaged backgrounds may be more likely to show motivation and persistence toward schoolwork if they see themselves as capable and successful in school subjects – regardless of the accuracy of their assessments. Thus, the positive attitudes of these learners and their parents may aid them in their achievement goals.

Van Wyk (1999b:86) maintains that race and ethnicity have an effect on the dropping out of school. According to Van Wyk (1999b:86), research shows that groups that have been disadvantaged historically tend to leave school early. Likewise, Natriello et al, (1990:16-17) concur and maintain that historically, members of minority groups (blacks in the United States of America) typically have failed to succeed in schools at the same levels as the majority of the white group. Gender is also regarded as a variable that has an influence on dropout. As Van Wyk (1999b:86) puts it, the sex role division of labour within the family and society influences the persistence in school by gender. In some communities, girls leave school earlier in order to perform household activities. But Steele (in Miller-Lachmann and Taylor (1995:101) maintains that grade retention rates and dropout for African-American boys are far high than those for African-American girls.

Van Wyk (1999b:87) also regards single-parent households as a variable that explains the risk of dropping out of school. Learners who live in single-parent households tend to have lower achievement rates and higher school dropout rates than do learners from traditional two-parent households. Likewise, Natriello et al (1990:23) maintain that learners in single-parent families are almost twice as likely to drop out of high school than learners from two-parent families. Also, limited proficiency in language of instruction. Learners whose primary language is not English or who have limited English proficiency face special obstacles to success in school (Natrielo et al, 1990:25 & Van Wyk, 1999b:87). These learners are at risk of educational failure because of difficulties with the language used in the classroom.

According to Van Wyk (1999b:87), educational attainment of parents has an impact of the learners. Low educational attainment of parents, especially mothers, has a negative effect on learner achievement. As Natriello et al (1990:25) express it, maternal education also is related to the likelihood of dropping out of high school. Parents whose level of education is low are unable to

assist their children with their schoolwork. Therefore, these parents cannot contribute meaningfully to the schooling of their children and some of these children then develop a negative attitude towards schooling and eventually dropout. Van Wyk (1999b:87) also regards community type as a variable that can explain the risk of dropping out of school. According to Van Wyk (1999b:87), rural residents, especially in developing countries drop out more frequently than their urban counterparts. Lack of schools, long distances between school and home, lack of flexible classes and the school year to meet the local populations' needs are some of the reasons cited.

Certain learner behaviours put them at risk of dropping out of school. These include: substance abuse, absenteeism and teenage pregnancy (Van Wyk, 1999b:87). Likewise, Miller-Lachmann and Taylor (1995:102) agree that boys (African-American boys) in general tend to have more conflicts with their predominantly female educators and this leads to these boys dropping out of school. This shows that learner behaviours can result in the learner dropping out of school. Therefore, the behaviour of the learners should be constantly monitored and inappropriate behaviour should be dealt with in time. According to Van Wyk (1999b:87-88), school characteristics also have a bearing on the dropout of learners. Dropping out has also been linked to features of school organisation and learner experience within schools, such as a lack of a climate of caring and support that has been shown to increase the likelihood of learners dropping out. As a result some learners leave the school because they no longer have interest in the school.

Lastly, environmental aspects are also perceived as having an impact on learner dropout. Schooling may be perceived as less relevant when learners see no connection between the curriculum of the school and the culture of their families and neighbourhoods (Van Wyk, 1999b:88). Natriello et al (1990:100) concur and maintain that while many learners leave school because they find the academic programme too difficult or overwhelming, others leave because they find it insufficiently challenging. Moreover, some learners see the school curriculum as not useful for their current and future endeavours.

The above key variables are more prevalent in disadvantaged schools and/or communities. Hence the level of learners who fail to complete school is high in these schools or communities.

3.5.7 Poverty

Poverty is viewed as a deficiency in the amounts of food, clothing and finance that are regarded as the minimum criteria for a decent standard of living (Prinsloo, 2002:65). According to Walker (2003:74), studies have long demonstrated the deleterious impact of poverty on learning and achievement. Morris (2005:22) agrees that hunger leads to physical stunting, lowers intelligence and increases susceptibility to diseases, severely limiting people's potential and that of whole communities and nations. Thus, for children leaving in poverty-stricken areas poverty has already had damaging effects on them well before they enter school. Such children are deprived of a stimulating environment (Natriello et al, 1990:5-6). Most of these children go to school on an empty stomach. As a result these children cannot concentrate well in the classroom and subsequently perform poorly academically.

Poverty in South Africa manifests in adverse factors such as ill health, undernourishment, a deprivation of privileges, backlogs in education, unsupportive environment (informal settlements and squatter camps), communication and language deficiencies, limited social status and a negative view of the future (Prinsloo, 2002:65). According to Morris (2005:22), the cycle of maternal and child malnutrition is one of the main ways that poverty passes from generation to generation. For learners, the most obvious result of poverty, often caused by unemployment and other economic inequalities, is the inability of families to meet basic needs such as nutrition and shelter (Department of Education, 1997:13). Likewise, Hillman (1996:3) maintains that poverty resulting from unemployment or low incomes results in stress, and reduces or precludes money being spent by families on learning resources such as books or learning opportunities such as outings and holidays. Poverty also increases the need for learners to be in paid employment in order to provide food for the poor family. As Hillman (1996:4) puts it, this reduces time for homework, in some cases, during the day causing absenteeism and acts as the first opportunity for the learner/s to leave the education system. However, Khattri et al (1997:80) maintain that in addition to poverty, other community characteristics may be important in determining a learner's opportunity to learn and to attain high levels of academic achievement. Thus, poverty alone cannot be an implicating factor in placing learners at risk of educational failure.

Maeroff (1998:2) is of the opinion that the problem of poverty can be addressed by providing support system to the learners from disadvantaged areas that is extended beyond the classroom.

Morris (2005:22) maintains that such a support system can actually help break the generation cycle of hunger and poverty. According to Hillman (1996:5), many schools in disadvantaged areas in the United Kingdom have been able to break the link between disadvantage and educational performance through having vision, providing a challenge to all learners whatever their perceived capabilities and by pursuing particular policies and practices. As a result these schools are able to succeed against the odds that they are faced with.

3.5.8 The effects of HIV/AIDS

Human immunodeficiency virus /Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (HIV/AIDS) is one of the major challenges facing the education sector, particularly schools in developing countries which happen to be disadvantaged. In fact, many disadvantaged schools are already experiencing the effects of the epidemic as educators, learners and the members of their families or relatives fall ill and/or die of HIV/AIDS related diseases. As a result Beresford (2001:21) maintains that many poor households affected by AIDS may not be able to afford to send their children to school. Thus, in addition to the challenges associated with school reform, the education system is faced with HIV/AIDS crisis (Human Rights Watch, 2001:32).

As HIV/AIDS associated illnesses are taking a toll on the education system, they disrupt education for all learners but especially girls (Human Rights Watch, 2001:68). Beresford (2001:21) concurs and maintains that girls are more likely to be kept out of school to become caregivers. For example, Beresford (2001:21) maintains that children may be the only able-bodied members of a household if the adults are sick or dead and are likely to concentrate more on survival and raising their siblings than on education. This implies that the cost of HIV/AIDS to education for all learners is high (Human Rights Watch, 2001:70). Likewise, Van Dyk (2001:153) maintains that HIV/AIDS has had a devastating effect on the educational system in many parts of the world where it sows havoc among learners and educators alike. Therefore, educators should not only teach learners about HIV/AIDS and other HIV/AIDS related diseases but should also learn more about HIV/AIDS and other related diseases. Furthermore, both educators and learners should know how to prevent disease transmission in schools, how to manage accidents and injuries and how to reduce the risk of transmitting illness to people with HIV/AIDS (Human Rights Watch, 2001:96).

According to Grober, et al (2002:13), the depleting economic growth is mainly due to the high rate of HIV/AIDS infection that in turn has an enormous impact on the education corps. This further increases the demands on education. But Van Dyk (2001:193) maintains that there are no known cases of HIV transmission in schools or institutions during educational activities. However, precautions should be taken at all times. For example, it is important to apply universal precautions when in contact with blood, open wounds, sores, breaks in the skin, grazes and open skin lesions. All body fluids and excretions (such as tears, saliva, mucus, phlegm, urine, vomit, faeces and pus) containing blood should also be handled with care (Van Dyk, 2001). It is, therefore, important that educators, learners and other stakeholders should not only be educated about the risks and danger of HIV/AIDS but also about all necessary measures that they should take in order to protect themselves from this pandemic. All stakeholders, particularly educators and learners should be encouraged to know their HIV status and where necessary be offered the necessary support.

3.6 IMPLEMENTING EDUCATIONAL REFORMS IN DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS

The implementation of educational reforms in disadvantaged schools and/or communities is influenced by a number of factors and these factors can, to some extent, determine whether these reforms can or cannot be successful. Thus, policy formulators and implementers should understand not only the context in which these policies are implemented but should also understand the factors that have an impact on the individual schools. According to Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:xvi), it should be remembered that schools are part of society and are affected by their immediate and broader social, political and economic contexts. What happens around the school has a bearing in the school and should, therefore, also be taken into account when formulating and implementing educational policies.

Structures in and outside of the school need to change to encourage, support and reflect the changes that people are committing themselves to (Davidoff & Lazarus, 2002:xviii). This can help create an environment that can be conducive to effective implementation of educational reforms in the school. However, Claassen (1999:8) contends that policy documents often omit the following two important items: how their proposals are going to be implemented (and by whom) and under what conditions they can be implemented successfully. De Clercq (1997b:143) argues that the African National Congress (ANC) policy proposals in South Africa do not sufficiently take into account the context and dynamics on the ground and are unable to develop strategies to influence the reform

process and practices at the lower levels of policy making. As a result the educational reforms proposed do not address the needs and aspirations of the majority of the population in the country. De Clercq (1997b:143) is, therefore, of the opinion that these policies are biased towards the interests of more organised sections of society and do not directly confront the needs and interests of the disadvantaged communities, thereby accentuating the social and educational inequalities of the past. As a result implementing educational reforms in disadvantaged schools always remain a mammoth task.

There are vast differences in resources between schools in disadvantaged schools, particularly those serving poor children in rural areas and schools in advantaged communities (Eisner, 1994:6). These differences influence the manner in which educational reforms are being implemented in these schools. But De Clercq (1997b:143) is of the opinion that policy formulators have an incomplete understanding of the structures, processes, actions and interactions between intended policies and what happens in the process of implementation. As a result the contexts in which these policies are implemented are not given enough attention. But Eisner (1994:2) is of the opinion that since the process of education always occurs within a particular context, decisions about educational practices need to be sensitive to that context. Lytle (2002:166), however, contends that policy developers do not give sufficient consideration to local context.

3.7 WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION IN DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS

Schools are not institutions isolated from their environments (Cullingford, 1997:116). Pretorius (1998:112) contends that it is in partnership with a specific community within which there are a variety of factors that influence the activities of the school. Thus, when implementing whole-school evaluation all factors that have a bearing on the school should be considered. According to Prain and Hand (2003:443), various factors, including the nature of the school influence the whole-school approach. Because of this disadvantaged schools can effect whole-school evaluation differently from the manner in which advantaged schools can affect it.

Quinlan and Davidoff (1997:13) are of the opinion that the context of a disadvantaged school compared with an advantaged school can impact very differently on school life, including the morale and motivation of educators, parents and the community in general. Thus, the implementation of whole-school evaluation should vary depending on the context in which it is

implemented. As Sack (2002:6) puts it, putting in place a successful whole-school model requires that districts carefully consider the individual needs and dynamics of each school. According to Lemmer (1998:118), what works well for some schools or learners may not work well for others. Thus, differences in schools should always be taken into account when implementing educational policies including whole-school evaluation. But it is not explicitly specified how whole-school evaluation should be conducted or implemented in different school set-ups. For example, how whole-school evaluation should be implemented in advantaged schools and/or disadvantaged schools. Eisner (1994:7), however, argues that policies by definition are general not particular. Thus, a policy that makes it possible for each particular problem to be addressed cannot be a policy at all.

According to Seekings (2002:1), whole-school evaluation should provide some information on what schools are actually doing, which schools might reveal the differences between schools that produce good results and those that produce poor ones. Meanwhile, Muijs et al (2004:1) maintain that in many countries there is a renewed interest to improve schools that are in difficult or challenging circumstances. These schools should, therefore, be identified so that assistance can be offered. Although Muijs et al (2004:1) point out that often, struggling schools are found in disadvantaged areas, they also argue that there are also many effective schools in these areas. But a school that is disadvantaged cannot effectively implement any new changes. Krug (1992:430), however, argues that some schools manage to succeed despite the overwhelming changes they face. Likewise, Muijs et al (2004:167) concur but argue that while many schools in disadvantaged areas can make short – term improvements, sustaining improvement is a big challenge for these schools.

Because of a combination of various factors schools are at different levels of development. According to Muijs et al (2004:151), one of the factors that may be crucial to schools is their socio-economic context. Therefore, disadvantaged schools should not be disadvantaged on the basis of their circumstances when conducting whole-school evaluation (cf 2.3.2). Individual school's circumstances should determine the manner in which whole-school evaluation is to be conducted in that particular school. (Eisner, 1994:7) contends that because the unique needs of particular individuals, constituencies and circumstances are unnoticed, they are neglected in educational policy. As a result the manner in which a policy or reform is implemented is affected. Muijs et al (2004:151) maintain that specific contextual circumstances suggest that different improvement

strategies are required for schools in difficult or challenging circumstances than those in more advantaged circumstances.

3.8 SUMMARY

In this chapter the managerial role of the principal as well as schooling in disadvantaged schools were explored. Both the local and international literature has been reviewed in order to determine how the managerial role of the principal is viewed. Also, the literature review was conducted in order to determine how schooling in disadvantaged schools is taking place and/or seen from different point of views.

The study reveals that the principal has a number of managerial roles that he/she should fulfill in order for effective teaching and learning to take place. However, pressure resulting from radical changes taking place worldwide sometimes makes it difficult for principals to perform his/her roles effectively. This has a negative impact on teaching and learning. Therefore, the principal needs to acquire the necessary skills in order to adapt to the changing environmental demands.

Meanwhile, schooling in disadvantaged schools reveals the disparities that exist between advantaged and disadvantaged schools. These disparities have an influence on the manner in which educational reforms are implemented. Consequently, this has an effect on the learner performance. As Natriello et al (1990:15) contend schools are an important influence promoting or retarding the educational success of the learner. Thus, Fataar (1997:83) is of opinion that the challenge is not only to expand schooling but also to address the low standard of existing schooling in the disadvantaged schools and/or communities.

The study also reveals that the family environment has an influence on the learner achievement. Measures such as poverty status, racial/ethnic group identity and family composition may signal not only limitations on family resources in support of education but also limitations on the resources available to learners from their schools and their communities (Natriello et al, 1990:16).

The next chapter deals with the research methodology and the strategies that will be followed in the empirical study.

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The preceding chapters form an important background to the investigation contained in this study. Chapter two provides a theoretical background to evaluation in education in general and whole-school evaluation in particular. It illustrates that evaluation, particularly whole-school evaluation, needs to be investigated. The chapter indicates that different individuals should perform certain roles in the whole-school evaluation. Therefore, the perceptions of the important role-players in the whole-school evaluation need to be investigated.

Chapter three looks at some of the roles that the principal should play in order for the school to achieve its objectives. This chapter also looks at how these roles are relevant to whole-school evaluation. The context of the disadvantaged schools/communities is also illustrated in this chapter. The chapter reveals that the complex problems experienced in disadvantaged schools need to be investigated. This chapter also looks at whole-school evaluation in the disadvantaged schools as well as the manner in which whole-school evaluation is conducted in disadvantaged schools.

Basically, the literature study covered in chapters two and three served to identify some of the crucial issues pertaining to the topic as well as to indicate gaps in the existing knowledge of the role of the principal in the implementation of the departmental policies. The research, therefore, addresses some of these questions through in-depth interviews with selected principals, Department of Education officials and educators who are teaching in disadvantaged schools and schools serving disadvantaged communities in the Province of KwaZulu-Natal.

This chapter begins with a discussion of qualitative research and is followed by a description of the design of the research. Thus, the main steps in the gathering of data for this research are described in this chapter as well as providing justification for the methods of data gathering and the analysis thereof.

4.2 THE USE OF A QUALITATIVE APPROACH TO RESEARCH

4.2.1 Qualitative research

Bodgan and Biklen (2003:2) regard qualitative research as an umbrella term that is used to refer to several research strategies that share certain characteristics. The data collected have been termed *soft* that is rich in description of people, places and conversations and not easily handled by statistical procedures. According to Mertens (2005:229), qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretative, material practices that make the world visible. Qualitative research is often exploratory, that is, it is often used when little is known about a certain topic or when an inductive approach is deemed more appropriate to learn more about a topic (Johnson & Christensen, 2004:30). Creswell (2003:30) concurs and adds that since not much has been written about the topic or the population being studied, the researcher seeks to listen to participants and builds an understanding based on their ideas.

The purpose of research is to discover answers to questions through the application of systematic procedures. Thus, qualitative research properly seeks answers to questions by examining various social settings and the individuals who inhabit these settings. Therefore, qualitative researchers are most interested in how humans arrange themselves and their settings and how inhabitants of these settings make sense of their surroundings through symbols, rituals, social structures, social roles and so forth (Berg, 2004:7). Likewise, Hoberg (1999:22) contends that research questions that are formulated are aimed at an investigation of topics in all their complexity and especially in context. However, Hoberg (1999:22) warns that qualitative researchers should not approach their research with specific questions to ask or hypotheses to test; they should develop a research focus as they collect their data. Neuman (2000:149) concurs and maintains that because qualitative researchers rarely know the most important issues or questions until after they become fully immersed in the data, they use early data collection to serve as a guide on how to adjust and sharpen the research questions. In accordance with the opinion of Best and Kahn (1993:82), qualitative studies leave open the possibility of change, to ask different questions and to go in the direction that the observation may lead the researcher. Qualitative research is, therefore, more open and responsive to its subject (Neuman, 2000:149).

According to Burns and Grove (2003:19), qualitative research is conducted to promote understanding of human experiences and situations and to develop theories that describe these experiences and situations. Thus, as Marshall and Rossman (1999:2) put it, qualitative research is pragmatic, interpretive and grounded in the lived experiences of people. However, Bodgan and Biklen (2003:2) maintain that qualitative research for education takes many forms and is conducted in many settings. Johnson and Christensen (2004:33) concur and contend that qualitative research uses a wide-angle lens, examining behaviour as it occurs naturalistically in all of its detail. Likewise, Leedy and Ormrod (2005:133) argue that although qualitative research encompasses several approaches to research that are, in some respects, quite different from one another, they all have two things in common. First, they focus on phenomena that occur in natural settings, that is, in the real world. Second, they involve studying those phenomena in all their complexity. As a result Berg (2004:3) is of the opinion that qualitative research, thus, refers to the meanings, concepts, definitions, characteristics, metaphors, symbols and descriptions of things.

According to Strauss and Corbin (1990:17-18), the term *qualitative research* is confusing because it can mean different things to different people. For example, some researchers gather data by means of interview and observation – techniques normally associated with qualitative methods. However, they then code that data in a manner that allows them to be statistically analysed. They are in effect, quantifying qualitative data. This means that no single definition of qualitative research can be acceptable to everyone. As Denzin and Lincoln (2000:2) put it, a complex, interconnected family of terms, concepts and assumptions surround the term *qualitative research*. Qualitative research fits in this study as Marshall and Rossman (1999:2) regards it as a broad approach to the study of social phenomena; its various genres are naturalistic and interpretive and they draw on multiple method of inquiry.

4.2.2 The role of the researcher

Qualitative researchers pay overt attention to the role of the researcher. This is because the researcher is seen to have direct effects on the research design, findings and interpretations of a study (Lankshear & Knobel, 2004:74). This implies that the role the researcher plays in qualitative research is very crucial to the study. Therefore, the researcher should not only understand his/her role but should also acquire skills to perform this role. According to Leedy and Ormrod (2005:133), qualitative researchers believe that the researcher's ability to interpret and make sense of what

he/she sees is critical for an understanding of any social phenomena. As a result the researcher is regarded as an instrument by many researchers using qualitative approaches to data collection (Patton, 2002:14; Lankshear & Knobel, 2004:74).

Johnson and Christensen (2004:188) maintain the researcher is said to be the data collection instrument because it is the researcher who must decide what is important and what data are to be recorded. Likewise, Leedy and Ormrod (2005:96) concur and maintain that the researcher is regarded as an instrument because the bulk of their data collection is dependent on his/her personal involvement (interviews, observations) in the setting. According to Neuman (2000:355-356), that the researcher is the instrument has two implications. First, it puts pressure on the researcher to be alert and sensitive to what happens in the field and to be disciplined about recording data. Second, it has personal consequences. Fieldwork involves social relationships and personal feelings. As Woods (1992:370-373) puts it, the researcher does not stand above and outside the research. The researcher is a finely tuned instrument with considerable skills but he/she is a person no less with values, beliefs and a self. Neuman (2000:356) concurs and maintains that the researcher tries to forge a friendly relationship, shares the same language, laughs and cries with the participants.

The researcher performs a variety of roles. These depend on research problems and procedures, their own characteristics and the personal attributes of the others (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992:112). Marshall and Ross (1999:80) concur and maintain that the researcher's role may vary as to its revealedness or the extent to which the fact that there is a study going on is known to the participants. Glesne and Peshkin (1992:112) are of the opinion that some of the roles may worry the researcher, while other roles may be attractive but perplexing in relationship to their data-gathering goal. Therefore, the researcher should begin with his/her research knowing the role that he/she needs to play quite well. This is likely to earn the respect of the participants but also to acquire more information from them. According to Marshall and Ross (1999:80), the researcher's role may vary in intensiveness and extensiveness, that is, the amount of time spent in the setting on a daily basis and the duration of the study over time.

In qualitative research, the researcher enters the world of the people he/she plans to study, gets to know, be known and trusted by them and systematically keeps a detailed written record of what is heard and observed (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:2). Johnson and Christensen (2004:34) agree and add that the researcher does not only write down what he/she sees as well as relevant insights but he/she

also write down his/her thoughts about both the environment and the participants. The researcher does this in order to identify the chief concerns of the various participants and audiences and to assess the merit, worth or meaning of the phenomena to the participants. To accomplish with this the researcher must determine what effects the setting, the participants and the observed phenomena have on each other (Tuckman, 1994:366). Therefore, the researcher's own background, interests and values are influential in selecting a topic for research (Woods, 1992:373). This clearly indicates that the researcher is an active participant in the study. But Best and Kahn (1993:199) warn that it is crucial that the researcher does not hold any preconceived notions regarding the outcome of the study.

In qualitative research the nature of the researcher-participants has an impact on the collection and interpretation of data. As a result participants in qualitative research are not research subjects in the usual sense of the world but they are colleagues. Therefore, the researcher must have the support and confidence of those individuals to complete the research (Burns & Grove, 2003:375). The researcher, therefore, must strive to build a relationship of reciprocal trust and rapport with the participants. Such relationships must not only be built but must also be maintained during the study. Johnson and Christensen (2004:183) maintain that if the researcher has managed to establish trust and rapport it becomes easier for the participant to provide information about his/her inner world. Likewise, Neuman (2000:356) maintains that the researcher builds a rapport by getting along with the participants. The researcher forges a friendly relationship, shares the same language and laughs and cries with the participants. However, Mouton (1996:158) warns that rapport is time consuming and it might not always be practical. Neuman (2000:356) concurs that it is not always easy to build rapport, as the social world is not all in harmony with warm and friendly people. Nonetheless, the researcher should strive to have a strong interpersonal relationship with the participants as it neutralises initial distrust (Mouton, 1996:158).

According to Glesne and Peshkin (1992:xii), qualitative researchers must be able to tolerate and perhaps even to enjoy ambiguity in their pursuit of complexity. Moreover, they tend to observe what others miss, listen when others talk and ask questions that others might not think to raise. They also regard themselves as learners who easily become consumed by their wonderment over their world. Bodgan and Biklen (2003:49) are of the opinion that qualitative researchers should proceed as if they know very little about the people and places they visit. This confirms that the qualitative researcher should perform different roles at different times during the study process. Qualitative

researchers attempt to cleanse their preconceptions mentally (Bodgan & Biklen, 1992:58). In this study the researcher tried by all means to put all preconceived ideas aside to allow the participants to explain their experiences and perceptions from their own point of view.

4.2.3 The choice of qualitative research for this study

The main objective of this research is to determine the extent of the role of the principal in whole-school evaluation in the context of disadvantaged schools/communities. But the lack of clarity regarding this issue dictates that an exploratory methodology that would enable the problems explored and the questions asked to become more specific be used. Research questions that are formulated are aimed at an investigation of topics in all their complexity and especially in context (Hoberg, 1999:22).

In the conduct of research, certain attributes are common to the discovery enterprise. This is true of both qualitative and quantitative designs (Streubert Speziale, 2003:16). The following characteristics of qualitative research make it an appropriate methodology for this research:

4.2.3.1 The researcher works in natural settings

Qualitative research involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of or to interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to term (Mertens, 2005:229). Miles and Huberman (1994:10) maintain that for many qualitative researchers the main object is to focus on naturally occurring ordinary events, in natural settings so that they have *a strong handle on what real life is like*. Thus, qualitative researchers are more interested in how humans arrange themselves and their settings and how inhabitants of these settings make sense of their surroundings through symbols, rituals, social structures, social roles and so forth (Berg, 2004:7). Thus, qualitative research is concerned with life as it is lived, things as they happen, situations as they are constructed in the day-to-day, moment-to-moment course of events (Bergh & Van Wyk, 1997:54).

This suggests a preference for participant observation, rather than experiments under artificial conditions, a preference for informal and less standardised interviews, rather than formal questionnaires (Vulliamy, Lewin & Stephens, 1990:11). For this study the researcher entered and

spent considerable time in the chosen schools. This was done because the researcher was concerned with context and felt that action can best be understood when it is observed in the setting in which it occurs (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:4). This enables the researcher to develop a level of detail about the individual or place and to be highly involved in actual experiences of the participants (Creswell, 2003:181). As Bodgan and Biklen (2003:4) put it, when the data with which qualitative researchers are concerned are produced by participants as in the case of official records, it is necessary to know where, how and under what circumstances data produced by the participants came into being (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:4-5). This approach was used in this research.

4.2.3.2 Small samples are used

Qualitative researchers view sampling processes *as dynamic, ad hoc* and *phasic* rather than static or a priori parameters of population (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:404). McMillan and Schumacher (2001:404), therefore, contend that the logic of the sample size is related to the purpose of the study, the research problem, the major data collection technique and the availability of the information-rich cases. The researcher in this research used these as the basis for determining the sample size.

Lemmer (1992:294) argues that although qualitative research does not exclude the use of large samples, most qualitative research studies use small samples hence such research focuses on the details and quality of individuals or small group's experiences. Leedy and Ormrod (2005:96) concur and maintain that rather than sample a large number of people with the intent of making generalisations, qualitative researchers tend to select a few participants who can best shed light on the phenomena under investigation. This characteristic is applicable to this study. Lemmer (1992:294) maintains that by doing qualitative research, the outside world of the formalised education system is related to the inside world of the participants and the complexities of situations, processes and action and interactions that are not shown by large scale statistical or macro studies within teaching.

4.2.3.3 Qualitative research is holistic

Qualitative research is holistic in the sense that it attempts to provide a contextual understanding of the complex interrelationship of causes and consequences that affect human behaviour (Vulliamy et

al, 1990:11). This explains why qualitative research studies appear as broad, panoramic views rather than micro-analyses (Creswell, 2003:182). This holistic approach assumes that the whole is understood as a complex system that is greater than the sum of its parts. Therefore, a description and interpretation of a person's social environment or an organisation's external context is essential for overall understanding of what has been observed during the fieldwork or said in an interview (Patton, 2002:59).

Although all that occurs within a setting is a potential source of data, qualitative researchers *cannot and do not need to observe everything*, but they can obtain sufficient data for a holistic emphasis (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:432). Patton (2002:59-60) maintains that to support holistic analysis, the qualitative researcher gathers data on multiple aspects of the setting under study to assemble a comprehensive and complete picture of the social dynamic of the particular situation or program. Within a holistic framework, qualitative research explores the depth, richness and complexity inherent in phenomena (Burns & Grove, 2003:357). This means that at a time of data collection, each case, event or setting under study, though treated as a unique entity with its own particular meaning and its constellation of relationships emerging from and related to the context within which it occurs, is also thought of as a window into the whole (Patton, 2002:60).

Creswell (2003:182) is of the opinion that the more complex, interactive and encompassing the narrative, the better the qualitative study. Johnson and Christensen (2004:33) contend that qualitative researchers do not want to intervene in the natural flow of behaviour because they believe that this intervention would change the behaviour. Qualitative researchers, therefore, study behaviour holistically. It was against this background that the holistic approach was followed in this study.

4.2.3.4 Qualitative data is descriptive

A major purpose of many social scientific studies is to describe situations and events. The researcher observes and then describes what was observed (Rubin & Babbie, 1997:109). As a result qualitative data usually take the form of words or pictures rather than numbers (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:5). Likewise, Neuman (2000:47) maintains that qualitative data are in the form of text, written words, phrases or symbols describing or representing people, actions and events in social life.

Patton (2002:437) contends that thick, rich description provides the foundation for qualitative analysis and reporting and takes the reader into the setting being described.

The written results contain quotations from the data to illustrate and substantiate the presentation. Moreover, the qualitative research approach demands that the world be examined with the assumption that nothing is trivial, that everything has the potential of being a clue that might unlock a more comprehensive understanding of what is being studied (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:5). The data must be descriptive – sufficiently descriptive that the reader can understand what occurred and how it occurred (Patton, 2002:23). The researcher analysed the data with all of their richness as closely as possible to the form in which they were recorded and transcribed. This was done because the written words are very important in the qualitative approach both in recording data and disseminating the findings (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:5). Where necessary, quotations were indented. As (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:6) put it, nothing was taken for granted and no statement escaped scrutiny. This is the approach that was used in this study.

4.2.3.5 Data are analysed inductively

Qualitative researchers do not search out data or evidence to prove or disprove hypotheses they hold before entering the study, rather, the abstractions are built as the particulars that have been gathered are grouped together (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:6). By using an inductive approach, the researcher can attempt to make sense of a situation without imposing pre-existing expectations on the phenomena under study (Mertens, 2005:230). Best and Kahn (1993:186) regard this approach as an openness to find whatever there is to find and this makes qualitative research unique.

According to Best and Kahn (1993:186), inductive analysis permits the researcher to discover reality without having to fit it into preconceived theoretical perspective. Inductive analysis involves *discovering* patterns, themes and categories in one's data (Patton, 2002:453). In this research the researcher followed this approach. Taylor and Bodgan (1998:8), however, warn that pure induction is impossible. Researchers can never escape all of their assumptions about the world. It is, therefore, important that researchers should be sensitive to unstated assumptions and unarticulated meanings.

4.2.3.6 Qualitative researchers try to understand people from their own frame of reference

Qualitative researchers tend to collect their data through sustained contact with people in settings where their subjects (participants) normally spend their time (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:2). Qualitative researchers, thus, empathise and identify with the people they study in order to understand how they see things (Taylor & Bodgan, 1998:7). In this study the researcher, therefore, includes personal experience and empathetic insight as part of the relevant data, while taking a neutral non-judgemental stance toward whatever content may emerge. As Taylor and Bodgan (1998:109) put it, what the qualitative researcher is interested in is not *truth* per se but rather perspectives.

The researcher attempts to capture data on the perceptions of local actors *from the inside,* through a process of deep attentiveness of empathetic understanding (*verstehen*) and suspending or *bracketing* preconceptions about the topics under discussion (Miles & Huberman, 1994:6). According to Patton (2002:52), *verstehen* means understanding and refers to the unique human capacity to make sense of the world. Burns and Grove (2003:375) warn that the researcher should be open to the perceptions of the participants rather than to attach his/her own meaning to the experience. This is the approach that the researcher followed in this study.

4.2.3.7 *Meaning* is of essential concern in the qualitative approach

Qualitative research is concerned with meanings as they appear to, or are achieved by, persons in lived social situations (Greene, 1988:175). The meaning people give to their experience and their process of interpretation are essential and constitutive, not accidental or secondary to what the experience is (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:25). Participants' meaning include their feelings, beliefs, ideas, thoughts and actions (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:395). The researcher requires information regarding the assumptions that people make about their lives and about what they take for granted. Bodgan and Biklen (2003:7) maintain that qualitative researchers are interested in how different people make sense of their lives. As a result they are concerned with making sure that they capture perspectives accurately.

Qualitative researchers seek to grasp the process by which people construct meaning and to describe what those meanings are (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:7). Likewise, McMillan and

Schumacher (2001:395) maintain that the researcher interprets phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. Taylor and Bodgan (1998:7) are of the opinion that qualitative researchers empathise and identify with the people they study in order to understand how these people see things. Meanings are constructed by human beings as they engage with the world they are interpreting. Qualitative researchers tend to use open-ended questions so that participants can express their views (Creswell, 2003:9). This is the approach that the researcher followed in this research.

Collected data is often shown to informants /participants/subjects for them to check the researcher's interpretations (Bergh & Van Wyk, 1997:55). Meanwhile, Bogdan and Biklen (2003:7) maintain that some researchers who use videotapes show the completed tapes to the participants in order to their own interpretations with those of the informants. Other researchers may show drafts of article or interview transcripts to key informants. In this study the transcripts of all the interviews were given to all participants to scrutinise and comment on in order to establish if what was said was the true reflection of what they actually meant.

4.2.3.8 Qualitative research is hypothesis generating

Vulliamy et al (1990:11) argues that qualitative research does not aim at testing preconceived hypotheses, as is the case in quantitative research. Rather, qualitative research aims at generating hypotheses and theories from the data that emerge. Likewise, Bodgan and Biklen (2003:49) contend that qualitative researchers avoid going into a study with hypotheses to test or specific questions to answer.

In qualitative research data are seldom collected with a view to supporting or rejecting hypotheses; the research problems in this research are also not always formulated in terms of hypotheses (Hoberg, 1999:192). This makes qualitative research appropriate for this study where the salient issues are not sufficiently and clearly visible at the onset.

4.2.3.9 Qualitative research is concerned with process rather than outcomes

Qualitative researchers are concerned with the process whereby certain behaviour is realised rather than merely with outcomes of behaviour (Lemmer, 1992:293). Thus, Johnson and Christensen

(2004:111-112) regard qualitative research as an ongoing and evolving process with the data collection process preceding more like a friendship between the participant and the researcher.

Patton (2002:159) maintains that qualitative research is highly appropriate for studying process because:

- Depicting process requires detailed descriptions of how people engage with each other.
- The experience of process typically varies for different people so their experiences need to be captured in their own words
- Process is fluid and dynamic so it cannot be fairly summarised on a single rating scale at one point in time
- Participants' perceptions are key process consideration.

Vulliamy et al (1990:11) maintain that by focusing on the process of social interaction, qualitative research involves the ongoing collection of data. Creswell (2003:181-182) concurs and maintains that the data collection process might change as doors open and close for data collection and the researcher learns the best sites at which to learn about the central phenomenon of interest. According to Patton (2002:159), a focus on process involves looking at how something happens rather than or in addition to examining outputs and outcomes. This approach was also used in this research.

4.2.4 Data collection strategy

Bodgan and Biklen (2003:109) regard data as any kind of information that researchers can identify and collect from the world they are studying in order to answer their problems. Data collection involves applying the measuring instrument to the sample or cases selected for the investigation (Mouton, 1996:67). Marshall and Rossman (1999:105) list the following four strategies on which qualitative researchers typically rely for gathering information: participation in the setting, direct observation, in-depth interviewing, analysing documents and material culture. Researchers use a variation of one or more of these strategies/techniques, depending on the strengths and/or limitations of each and on other considerations.

Data collection produces new information or data about the world that requires further processing (Mouton, 1996:67). Data collection is always selective (Lankshear & Knobel, 2004:172). Thus, researchers cannot collect all potential data concerning a phenomenon. They must make decisions at strategic points about what to include and exclude (Lankshear & Knobel, 2004:172). The choice of strategy depends on the focus of the research and the desired time frame for the study (Best & Kahn, 1993:190). Leedy and Ormrod (2005:143) are of the opinion that regardless of the kinds of data involved, data collection in a qualitative study takes a great deal of time. The researcher should, therefore, determine what is to be studied and also the duration of the study before choosing a data collection strategy.

Different questions have different implications for data collection. Therefore, the researcher should choose techniques that are likely to elicit data needed to gain understanding of the phenomenon in question, contribute different perspectives on the issue and make effective use of the time available for data collection (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992:24). Creswell (2003:179) maintains that strategies chosen have a dramatic influence on the procedures to be followed in the study. For the purpose of these study observations, *individual interviews* and *focus group interviews* were chosen and the rationale for choosing these data collection strategies are discussed below.

4.2.4.1 Observation

Observation is an active process that includes *nonverbal cues* – facial expressions, gestures, tone of voice, body movements and other unverbalised social interactions that suggest the subtle meanings of language (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:439). Observation entails the systematic noting and recording of events, behaviours and artifacts (objects) in the social setting chosen for study (Marshall & Rossman, 1999:107). Many terms are used for describing field-based observations including *participant observation, fieldwork, qualitative observation, direct observation and field research* (Patton, 2002:262).

Participant observation enables the researcher to obtain people's perceptions of reality expressed in their actions and expressed as feelings, thoughts and beliefs. These perceptions or constructions take three forms: verbal, nonverbal and tacit knowledge (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:437-439). The meaning and significance of people's verbal and nonverbal symbols can only be determined in the context of what they actually do and after an extend period of time. There is danger of imputing

meaning that people did not intend (Taylor & Bodgan, 1998:65-66). Patton (2002:262-264) regards the following as the advantages of observation:

- Through direct observations the researcher is better able to understand and capture the context within which people interact.
- Firsthand experience with a setting and the people in the setting allows the researcher to be open, discovery oriented and inductive because by being on-site the observer has less need to rely on prior conceptualisations of the setting.
- The researcher has the opportunity to see things that may routinely escape awareness among the people in the setting.
- Direct observation is the chance to learn things that people would be unwilling to talk about in an interview.
- It provides the researcher with the opportunity to move beyond the selective perceptions of others.
- It permits the researcher to draw on personal knowledge during the formal interpretation stage of analysis.

It was against this background that the researcher also used observation as one of the data collection techniques. The researcher ensured that he observed events as they take place in the settings but caused as little disruption as possible. As McMillan and Schumacher (2001:440) put it, although the researcher non-interfered, he actively did seek different views of events from different participants for accuracy and for confirmation. As a result observation accorded the researcher not only with the opportunity to acquire more experience in both primary school and secondary school but also with the opportunity to learn about the life-world of the participants.

The data collected through the observations were triangulated by means of interviews (both individual and focus group interviews).

4.2.4.2 Interviews

Qualitative researchers rely quite extensively on in-depth interviewing (Marshall & Rossman, 1999:108). Interviewing may be defined simply as a conversation with the purpose of gathering information (Berg, 2004:75). During the interview, the researcher and the participant are actively

engaged in constructing a version of the world. The process of interviewing is performed so that a deep mutual understanding is achieved (Burns & Grove, 2003:376). The purpose of interviewing is to find out what is in or on someone else's mind (Best & Kahn, 1993:199). Fontana and Frey (2000:645) regard interviewing as one of the most common and powerful ways one can use to try to understand fellow human beings. In the field of research, interviewing provides the chance to enter into the participants' perspective. Patton (2002:341) contends that qualitative interviewing begins with the assumption that the perspective of others is meaningful, knowable and able to be made explicit.

In qualitative research, interviews may be used in two ways. They may be the dominant strategy for data collection or they may be employed in conjunction with participant observation, document analysis or other techniques (Bodgan and Biklen, 2003:95). As Marshall and Rossman (1999:110) put it, combined with observation, interviews allow the researcher to understand the meanings that people hold for their everyday activities. Johnson & Christensen (2004:183) maintain that qualitative interviews are also called depth interviews because they can be used to obtain in-depth information about a participant's thoughts, beliefs, knowledge, reasoning, motivations and feeling about a topic.

Qualitative interviewing requires asking truly open-ended questions (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:446). Interviewing brings together different people and personalities (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992:75). Therefore, interviews should always be handled cautiously. Marshall and Rossman (1999:110) are of the opinion that since interviews involve personal interaction, co-operation is essential. In this study individual and focus group interviews were used.

4.2.4.2.1 Individual interviews

Most interviews are conducted in a private setting with one person at a time so that the participant feels free to express himself/herself fully and truthfully (Van Dalen, 1979:159). When interviewed individually participants are more likely to reveal more information about the topic, as they are not threatened by the presence of others. The researcher, therefore, felt that individual interviews are an appropriate data collection strategy for eliciting data from both the school principals and the Department of Education officials.

Van Dalen (1979:158) maintains that through participants' incidental comments, facial and bodily expressions and tone of voice an interviewer acquires information that would not be conveyed in written replies. The researcher decided, therefore, to have a direct contact in a face-to-face meeting with the school principals as well as with the Department of Education officials. As Baily, Bemrose, Goddard, Impey, Joslyn and Mackness (1995:66) suggest, participants were allowed to express themselves in their own unique way and this was done in order to elicitate more authentic responses. According to Marshall and Rossman (1999:108), the researcher explores a few general topics to help uncover the participant's views but otherwise respects how the participant frames and structures the responses. This, in fact, is an assumption fundamental to qualitative research: The participant's perspective on the phenomenon of interest should unfold as the participant views it, not as the researcher views it.

It was indicated in chapter one (cf 1.8) that school principals were interviewed individually because they might have unique problems and experiences and be reluctant to share these should other principals be present. It would also have been too expensive and time consuming to assemble them as they were from different schools. Moreover, interviewing them individually was useful as it enabled them to talk freely about the subject. The researcher also decided to interview the four Department of Education officials individually as their busy schedules would have made it difficult to interview them together. They might also not have felt comfortable to express themselves freely in the present of another official. This would have compromised the study.

4.2.4.2.2 Focus group interviews

Focus groups are another strategy for collecting qualitative research data (Streubert Speziale, 2003:29). Johnson & Christensen (2004:185) concur and maintain that focus groups are used to collect qualitative data that are in the words of the group participants. Berg (2004:123) regards focus group as an interview style designed for small groups. Focus groups are typically composed of six to ten people, but the size can range from as few as four to as many as twelve (Krueger, 1994:17). According to Schurink, Schurink and Poggenpoel (1998:314), the focus group interview enables the researcher to develop inductively, that is, from the bottom up rather than from the top down, concepts, generalizations and theories that are grounded in or reflect the intimate knowledge of the people participating in the focus group interview.

Focus group is called a *focus* group because the moderator keeps the individuals in the group focused on the topic being discussed (Johnson & Christensen, 2004:185). Wilkinson and Birmingham (2003:90) concur and maintain that focus group interview is used to gather rich, descriptive data in a small group format from participants who have agreed to *focus* on a topic of mutual interest. The researcher uses focus group interviews in the hope that participants can stimulate each other since while the topic being discussed is familiar to all of them but they also have their own individual attitudes, perspectives, perceptions, interests and assumptions regarding the topic. As Rubin and Babbie (1997:573) put it, participants are selected for the focus group on the basis of their relevancy to the topic being discussed. Thus, the informal group discussion atmosphere of the focus group structure is intended to encourage participants to speak freely and completely about behaviours, attitudes and opinions they possess (Berg, 2004:123).

Focus group interviews are useful when the topic to explore is general and the purpose is either to stimulate talk from multiple perspectives from the group participants so that the researcher can learn what the range of views are or to promote talk on a topic that informants might not be able to talk so thoughtfully about in individual interviews (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:101). Focus group interviews, therefore, provide the researcher with insights about what to pursue in individual interviews. Patton (2002:386) maintains that unlike in individual interviews, in a focus group participants get to hear each other's responses and to make additional comments beyond their own original responses as they hear what other people have to say. Thus, focus group interviews were used for groups of educators, but as Patton (2002:386) suggests participants were not expected to agree with each other or to reach any kind of consensus. Focus group interviews were conducted because the researcher felt that it would have been time consuming to conduct individual interviews with so many participants.

4.2.5 Reliability and validity of research

Shimahara (1988:86) regards reliability and validity of research as crucial in all social research regardless of disciplines and methods employed. Neuman (2000:164) contends that reliability and validity are salient issues because constructs in social theory are often ambiguous, diffuse and not directly observable. LeCompte and Goetz (1982:32) maintain that while reliability is concerned with the replicability of research findings, validity is concerned with the accuracy of scientific findings.

In qualitative research, issues of instrument validity and reliability ride largely on the skills of the researcher (Miles & Huberman, 1994:38). Goetz and LeCompte (in Wolcott, 1990:126) argue that reliability poses serious threats to the credibility of much ethnographic work. However, validity may be its major strengths. Triangulation can, therefore, help to enhance the reliability and validity of the research. Denzin (in Patton, 2002:247), Carpenter and Jenks (2003:300-308) and Berg (2004:5-6) identify the following four basic types of triangulation:

- Data triangulation : the use of a variety of data sources in a study. *"Data sources"* does not mean using different methods (Johnson & Christensen, 2004:255). According to Bodgan and Biklen (2003:107), this means that many sources of data are better in a study than a single source because multiple sources lead to a fuller understanding of the phenomena the researcher is studying. Berg (2004:31) warns that the researcher must decide whether to use one data collection strategy alone or to combine several strategies (data triangulation). Taylor and Bodgan (1998:80) are of the opinion that by drawing on other types and sources of data, researchers also gain a deeper and clearer understanding of the setting and people being studied. According to Johnson and Christensen (2004:255), another important part of data triangulation involves collecting data at different times, at different places and with different people.
- Investigator triangulation : the use of several different researchers or evaluators. Taylor and Bodgan (1998:80) contend that triangulation may also be used as a way of checking out insights gleaned different informants or different sources of data. Likewise, Patton (2002:560) maintains that investigator triangulation helps to reduce the potential bias that comes from a single person doing all the data collection and provides means of more directly assessing the consistency of the data obtained. As Taylor and Bodgan (1998:81) put it, since researchers differ in social skills and ability to relate to different people, they can play different roles in the field and study different perspectives
- Theory triangulation : the use of multiple perspectives to interpret a single set of data. Berg (2004:31) is of the opinion that the researcher must also consider whether the study will be framed by a single overarching theory or by several related theories (theoretical triangulation). Johnson and Christensen (2004:253) are of the opinion that the various theories might provide the researcher with insights and help to develop a more cogent explanation. By considering rival explanations throughout analysis of qualitative data, researchers are more likely to gain a complete or holistic understanding (Carpenter & Jenks, 2003:307).

- Methodological triangulation : the use of multiple methods to study a single problem or programme. Neuman (2000:171) maintains that methodological triangulation deals with systematic error by using several different research methods to collect the same information. By combining several methods, researchers obtain a better, more substantive picture of reality; a richer, more complete array of symbols and theoretical concepts and a means of verifying many of these elements (Berg, 2004:5). Johnson and Christensen (2004:254) are of the opinion that the weaknesses and strengths of one method will tend to be different from those of a different method which means that when a researcher combines two or more methods he/she can have better evidence. In other words, the whole is better than its parts.

Van Wyk (1996:141), however, argues that not all the types of triangulation need to be done but only the amount needed to satisfy the researcher that the results of the research are valid. The researcher in this study followed this approach. Reliability and validity are again discussed in 4.3.13.

4.2.6 Ethical considerations in qualitative research

Qualitative researchers frequently face ethical dilemmas and make decisions to resolve these in order to continue the study. A record is maintained of the decisions, the persons involved, the actions taken and the impact on the study (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:413). Taylor and Bodgan (1998:36) maintain that ethical decisions necessarily involve one's personal sense of what is right. As a result one must choose among a number of moral alternatives and responsibilities. Glesne and Pushkin (1992:109) regard ethical considerations as inseparable from the researcher's everyday interactions with his/her participants and with his/her data.

Ethical issues and standards must be critically considered in any research study. Researchers have a professional responsibility to ensure the design of both quantitative and qualitative studies that maintain ethical principles and protect human rights (Carpenter, 2003:311). Marshall and Rossman (1999:90) maintain that the researcher must demonstrate awareness of the complex ethical issues in qualitative research and show that the research is both feasible and ethical. Thus, the qualitative researcher should take ethical issues into account during and after data collection, as well as during data analysis. Bodgan and Biklen (2003:44-45) regard the following as some of the strategies that qualitative researchers can develop to support ethical approaches to fieldwork:

- The researcher must avoid researching sites where informants may feel coerced to participate in the research. Carpenter (2003:314) contends that participants must not be harmed, thereby supporting the principle of *beneficence*. Therefore, if the researchers sense that the interview is causing issues to surface that may result in serious consequences, they must protect the welfare of the participants, perhaps by ending the interview or providing follow-up counseling.
- The researcher must honour the informants' privacy. Glesne and Peshkin (1992:117) maintain that researchers must consciously consider and protect the rights of participants to privacy.
- The identity of the participants must be protected unless the participants have agreed that their identities can be revealed. To protect the identity and anonymity of the participants, pseudonyms must be used (Marshall & Rossman, 1999:97). This approach was followed in this study.
- Participants must be treated with respect and the researcher must seek their co-operation in the research. Therefore, Carpenter (2003:315) maintains that participants must know from the beginning of and be reminded throughout the investigation that they have the right to withdraw from the research study at any time.
- The researcher must abide by the agreed terms regarding the permission to do a study. Johnson and Christensen (2004:109) concur but argue that sometimes providing full disclosure of the nature and purpose of the study can alter the outcome and invalidate the study. Therefore, in such instances, it is necessary to mislead or withhold information from the research participants. This approach was not, however, followed in this study.
- The researcher must tell the truth when writing and reporting his/her findings. As Creswell (2003:66) puts it, the ethical issues do not stop with data collection and analysis, they also extend into the actual writing and dissemination of the final research report. Carpenter (2003:316) is of the opinion that a researcher's integrity can become damaged if the researcher uses deception to generate data. According to Creswell (2003:64-64), deception occurs when participants understand one purpose for a study but the researcher has a different purpose in mind.

In this study the researcher has followed these guidelines in order to maintain a record of ethical considerations. For example, pseudonyms have been used to protect the identities of the participants.

4.3 THE DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH

According to Lankshear and Knobel (2004:21), a research design is a broad strategic approach or *logic* for conducting the research. Therefore, it must match the kind of question being discussed. Berg (2004:31) regards the design for a research project, as the plan of the study will be conducted. Bless and Higson-Smith (1995:63) concur, adding though, that research design has two meanings: First, it can be understood as the planning of any scientific research from the first to the last step. In this sense it is a programme to guide the researcher in collecting, analysing and interpreting observed facts. Second, it is regarded as a specification of the most adequate operations to be performed in order to test a specific hypothesis under given conditions. Thus, it indicates a procedure by which the co-variance of a suitable time-order can be proved.

The design stage of research is concerned with a series of important decisions having to do with the research idea or question/s (Berg, 2004:31). Leedy and Ormrod (2005:85) contend that a research design provides the overall structure for the procedures that the researcher follows, the data that the researcher collects and the data analyses that the researcher conducts. As a result Leedy and Ormrod (2005:85) are of the opinion that nothing helps a research effort to be successful so much as planning the overall design carefully. However, the challenge for the researcher is to figure out which design and methods are most appropriate, productive and useful in a given situation (Patton, 2002:255). Likewise, Bless and Higson-Smith (1995:67) maintain that every project requires a research design that is carefully tailored to the exact needs of the researcher as well as the problem.

The research design adopted in this study is naturalistic in the sense that the research takes place in real world settings and the researcher does not attempt to manipulate the phenomenon of interest, for example, participants, events, programmes, relationship and interaction (Patton, 2002:39). In this research the researcher is not concerned with generalisability to a wider population and only accurate and adequate description of the situation being studied is paramount (Wierma, 1991:219).

4.3.1 Choice of qualitative methodology

Methodology is a more generic term that refers to the general logic and theoretical perspective for a research project (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:31). Quantitative and qualitative approaches are the two research methodologies use in education (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:15). People tend adhere

to the methodology that is consonant with their socialised worldview (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992:9). As a result when choosing a methodology the researcher has to decide whether to use a qualitative methodology or a quantitative methodology or a combination of both. Hoberg (1999:21), however, maintains that the choice of research methodology is ultimately determined by the research problem. Taylor and Bodgan (1998:90) concur and add that the research interests, the circumstances of the setting or the people to be studied and the practical constraints faced by the researcher, should determine the choice of research method.

Quantitative and qualitative researches are distinguished by different views of human behaviour (Johnson & Christensen, 2004:32). Since the aim of this research is to obtain the perceptions of the participants regarding the research topic, the researcher felt that a qualitative methodology is most appropriate. According to Taylor and Bodgan (1998:7), qualitative methodology refers to research that produces descriptive data – people's own written or spoken words and observable behaviour. Marshall and Rossman (1999:57) argue that for a study focusing on individuals' lived experience, one cannot understand human actions without understanding the meaning that participants attribute to those actions – their thoughts, feelings, beliefs, values and assumptive worlds. The researcher, therefore, needs to understand the deeper perspectives captured through face-to-face interaction. It is, therefore, hoped that this exploratory research methodology would enable the problem explored to be clearer when data have been gathered and analysed.

4.3.2 Statement of subjectivity

Marshall and Rossman (1999:194) maintain that a qualitative research proposal should respond to concerns that the natural subjectivity of the researcher will shape the research. Thus, Greene (1988:175) warns that qualitative research cannot be carried out by people who see themselves as detached, neutral observers, concerned with the kinds of observation measurement and prediction that are presumed to be unbiased and unaffected by the enquirer's vantage point in the world. As McMillan and Schumacher (2001:411) put it, disciplined subjectivity reminds many researchers that the inquirer is part of the setting, context and social phenomenon that he/she seeks to understand.

Bodgan & Biklen (2003:33) maintain that qualitative researchers have wrestled over the years with charges that it is too easy for the prejudices and attitudes of the researcher to bias data. The worry

about subjectivity arises particularly when the data must *go through* the researcher's mind before they are put on paper. As McMillan and Schumacher (2001:411) put it, all data are processed or reconstructed through the researcher's mind as the report is written. Thus, the subjectivity of the researcher should be clearly stated in the research design, as it has a positive or negative effect on the study. McMillan and Schumacher (2001:411) maintain that qualitative researchers, rather than deny human subjectivity, take into account subjectivity through methodological strategies. As Rubin and Babbie (1997:28) put it, because of their vested interests in finding certain results, researchers often devise ways of observing phenomena that attempt to prevent their biases from influencing what is observed.

Qualitative researchers are concerned with the effect that their own subjectivity may have on the data and papers they produce (LeCompte in Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:33). But McMillan and Schumacher (2001:412) contend that data obtained from informants are valid even though they may represent a particular view or have been influenced by the researcher's presence. Qualitative researchers guard against their own biases by recording detailed field notes that includes reflections on their own subjectivity (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:33). Marshall and Rossman (1999:196) maintain that the researcher should state clearly any assumptions that may effect the study. Biases are expressed and the researcher engages in some preliminary self-reflection to uncover personal subjectivities. Awareness of their bias helps researchers identify a particular frame of reference that may limit or direct their data interpretation (Lewenson, 2003:219). Bodgan and Biklen (2003:34) are of the opinion that researcher' biases may only be limited but not eliminated.

It is important for all qualitative researchers to note background characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, occupation, own interests, age, et cetera as possible attributes that could enhance or hinder the research (Van Wyk, 1996:153). Lewenson (2003:219) maintains that in their search of true meanings and in their attempts to bridge the gap, researchers must not only be aware of their own bias and that of ideology but also bias from the sources themselves that may impede interpretation. Patton (2002:566) maintains that because the researcher is the instrument in the qualitative inquiry, a qualitative report must include information about the researcher. It is against this background that the researcher in this study included the following information:

4.3.2.1 The language issue

The researcher and the participants come from the same cultural background and they speak the same language. As a result the participants did not see the researcher as a stranger. Thus, the participants were able to discuss issues with the researcher.

But the researcher remained cautious during his interactions with the participants and did not take advantage of the fact the researcher and the participants come from the same cultural background. Bodgan and Biklen (2003:87) warn that skin colour, race and cultural identity sometimes facilitate, sometimes complicate and sometimes erect barriers in fieldwork. Bodgan and Biklen (2003:87) add that this seems to be true both when researchers are studying people within their ethnic group. Meanwhile, Burns and Grove (2003:375) warn that the researcher must avoid going nature that is, becoming a part of the culture and loose all objectivity doing with the ability to observe clearly.

LeCompte and Preissle (1993:95) believe that the issue of language fluency is critical. The fact that the researcher and the participants speak the same language eliminated problems that might have been experienced should a translator have been used. Because all participants understand English all interviews were conducted in English. However, the researcher and the participants at times used IsiZulu to clarify certain points. This was in accordance with what LeCompte and Preissle (1993:95) maintain that even researchers working within their own language and culture may find that meanings they attribute to sayings or actions may not be the same as those given by their participants.

4.3.2.2 Status

The status of the researcher is crucial to data collection, as it can determine the type of data that can be obtained. It is, therefore, important that the position of the researcher in the community should be made known. Best and Kahn (1993:199), however, maintains that interview data can easily become biased and misleading if the person being interviewed is aware of the perspective of the interviewer. Too often, interviewees provide information based upon what they think the interviewer wants to hear.

The researcher in this study is a deputy principal in a school in the KwaMashu area. As a result the researcher is in a better position to interact with both the educators and principals. However, the researcher entered the field as a *learner* and tried not to impose his opinions on the research. As Best and Kahn (1993:199) suggest, the researcher tried to make sure that the participants understand that the researcher does not hold any preconceived notions regarding the outcome of the study (cf. 4.2.2).

Fontana and Frey (2000:658) contend that the emphasis in interviewing is shifting to allow the development of closer relationship between the interviewer and the participants. This attempts to minimise status differences and doing away with the traditional hierarchical situation in interviewing. As Burns and Grove (2003:374-375) put it, the nature of the researcher-participant relationship has an impact on the collection and interpretation of data. Therefore, this relationship should be maintained. Conclusions reached by qualitative researchers are qualified by the social roles investigators hold within the research site (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993:334). This is the approached that the researcher followed.

4.3.2.3 Gender

Bodgan and Biklen (2003:87) regard gender as one of the significant characteristics of the researcher. Glesne and Pushkin (1992:95) maintain that although the researcher has a lesser degree of control over gender, age and ethnicity, these can also make a difference in the researcher's access to data.

Rubin and Babbie (1997:77) maintain that studies with gender bias or insensitivity may be seen as perpetuating a male-dominated world or failing to consider different implications for males and women in one's research. However, in this study the question of gender never seemed to have an inhibiting effect on any of the discussions during the interview processes. The researcher regarded both male and female participants as equal partners. Participants both males and females co-operated with the researcher and female participants did not show any signs of being threatened by the fact that the researcher is a male.

4.3.3 Rationale for doing research in KwaMashu

The background history and geographical position of KwaMashu is briefly discussed in chapter one (cf 1.1.1). Also the reasons for conducting a research in KwaMashu were stated in chapter one (cf 1.5). Often, the selection of research place or places is built into the problem (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992:23). This research focuses on the managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation within the context of disadvantaged schools in KwaZulu-Natal. KwaMashu township is one of the previously disadvantaged areas in the KwaZulu-Natal Province and the majority of the community members are unemployed. KwaMashu schools are considered to be among the disadvantaged schools in the KwaZulu-Natal Province.

Glesne and Peshkin (1992:23) maintain that researchers have to develop a rationale for selecting one or more sites for data collection. The decision to conduct the research in KwaMashu rested on the researcher's familiarity with the area. The researcher grew up, was educated and is presently working in KwaMashu. As a result the researcher is not only familiar with the people in the teaching fraternity but also with the majority of the community members. The researcher has, therefore, background knowledge of each unit (section) in KwaMashu. The researcher also knows the politics and dynamics of each an every section in the township.

Familiarities with the area made it possible for the researcher to choose those schools are situated in relatively safe areas. However, Van Wyk (1996:158) citing examples maintains that the safety of the researchers in impoverished communities is not something that can be guaranteed. This could, however, not stop the researcher conducting research at KwaMashu because this where the researcher grew up and was also educated. Marshall and Rossman (1999:72) suggest that site and sample selection should be planned around practical issues, such as the researcher's comfort, ability to fit into some role during participant observation and access to a range of subgroups and activities.

4.3.4 Choice of schools

Qualitative researchers seek to understand the context or setting of the participants through visiting this context and gathering information personally (Creswell, 2003:9). Bodgan and Biklen (2003:73) maintain that most qualitative researchers collect data by going to the participants and spend time with them in their territory, for example, in their schools, their playgrounds, their hangouts and their

homes. These are the places where the participants do what they normally do and it is these natural settings that the researcher wants to study. For this study the researcher chose schools that are within easy reach. Although these schools were chosen because of their proximity and accessibility, they can also be said to be similar to other schools in KwaMashu (Mazibuko, 2003:48). However, besides proximity and accessibility, there were other factors that were taken into account when choosing these schools. For example, the researcher chose schools where he would feel safe to conduct research and also considered the willingness of the principals and educators to participate in the research.

Choosing a site is a negotiation process to obtain freedom of access to a site that is *suitable* for the research problem and *feasible* for the researcher's resources of time, mobility and skills (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:432). The ideal research setting is one in which the observer obtains easy access, establishes immediate rapport with informants and gathers data directly related to the research interests. Such settings seldom exist (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998:27). As the researcher is familiar with most schools in KwaMashu, the researcher choose those school that he felt he would be accepted and where he would feel comfortable working (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992:24). As Van Wyk (1996:158) suggests, it was necessary to select schools where the atmosphere was conducive to research, since such an atmosphere is not always a *sine qua non*. The selected schools were, therefore, considered suitable for conducting this research.

The researcher's goal was to increase the participants' level of comfort, encouraging them to talk about what they normally talk about and to eventually confide in the researcher (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:73). However, the researcher was aware of the danger of conducting a research in sites where participants know the researcher and his status. For example, knowing the status of the researcher may lead to some of the participants reluctant to reveal useful information. As Streubert Speziale (2003:23) puts it, participants may not wish to share their thoughts or feelings in one setting or at all. Glesne & Peshkin (1992:22) warn that previous experiences with settings or people can set up expectations for certain types of interactions that will constrain effective data collections. Thus, the participants at any time may decline to share their perceptions, feelings and thoughts with the researcher (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:433).

Particulars of the four schools selected are provided in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Characteristics of schools

Schools' characteristics	School A (Primary school)	School B (Secondary school)	School C (Primary school)	School D (Secondary school)
Medium of instruction	IsiZulu and English	English	IsiZulu and English	English
Number of learners	529	632	772	1096
Number of educators	21	18	20	28
Number of classrooms	16	22	18	23
Staff room/s	1	1	1	1
Strong room	2	1	None	2
Principal's office	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Administration staff	1	1	1	1
Deputy principal	1	1	1	2
Head of Department	3	4	3	4
Telephone	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fax	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Photocopier/s	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Computer/s	Yes (22)	Yes (2)	Yes (1)	Yes (48)
Code of conduct (learners)	Written	Written	Written	Written
Security at school	Fenced	Fenced	Fenced	Fenced
Security guard/s	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (4)
Library	Yes	Yes	None	Yes
Laboratory	None	None	None	None
Hall	Yes	None	None	Yes
Toilet facilities	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Electricity	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Running water	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sport-fields	Soccer and Netball	None	None	Soccer

- **The chosen schools**

All schools chosen are easily reached by tarred roads. These schools are situated in different sections (units) in the township and minor roads reach all except one. Despite the fact one school is situated along the busy main road, there are no traffic signs showing that learners are crossing the road and/or that there is a school. Speeding taxis transporting learners to and from different schools and other community members in transit use this main road. Concrete fences surround all schools. But in all cases the fences are not intact, as a result learners who come late use these open spaces (openings) to get into these schools.

Security personnel man gates in all schools. Although gates were locked all the time, visitors are let in without their details being taken down and/or checked out. Schools A, B, and D have tuck shops. School C has no tuck shop and learners are expected to bring along their provision, as they are not allowed to go out of school at any time during the day. In all schools only learners with valid reasons are permitted to leave school during the day. Next to the gates of all schools hawkers, particularly women, sell fruits, chips, broken biscuits, sweets, sausages and juice to learners during the break and lunch times for income. All schools have well-paved parking areas.

Schools A and C (both primary schools) are well cared for and classrooms are very clean. Yards in both schools are also very clean and the grass is cut. In contrast, schools B and D (both secondary schools) are not well cared for and classrooms are dirty. Schoolyards in school B and D are very dirty, especially after lunch. Learners litter during the break and lunch times as there are no dustbins where learners can place garbage. However, in schools A and C the level of littering is minimal as there are dustbins all over the schools. Generally, buildings in schools A and C are in good condition and neat. Meanwhile, in both secondary schools (schools B and D) buildings are not in good condition, graffiti on walls and unacceptable language is seen on walls.

The availability of facilities varies from school to school. But in general, all schools have limited facilities. However, the schools chosen are similar to most schools in the KwaMashu township since they all have basic facilities, such as classrooms, running water, toilets, furniture. But these facilities are not adequate in most if not all schools in KwaMashu.

4.3.5 Negotiation of access

The first problem that the researcher faces in fieldwork is getting permission to conduct his/her study (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:75). Berg (2004:159) maintains that accounts of how qualitative researchers gain entry to research settings vary from situation to situation. Marshall and Rossman (1999:81) contend that the energy that comes from high personal interest (called bias in traditional research) is useful for gaining access. Access may be a continuous issue when the researcher moves around in various settings within an organisation.

Getting into a setting is often hard work. It may require diligence and patience. The researcher must negotiate access, gradually win trust and slowly collect data that only sometimes fit his of her

interests (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998:27). Gaining entry into the field requires establishing good relations with all individuals at the research site. Research permission comes without a guarantee that the participants will behave naturally before an outsider who takes field notes or that the participants will share their perceptions, thoughts and feelings with the observer (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:432). Bodgan and Biklen (2003:77) concur that getting permission to conduct the study involves more than getting an official blessing. It involves laying the groundwork for good rapport with those with whom the researcher will be spending time, so they will accept him/her and what he/she is doing.

The researcher visited the chosen schools, requested permission to conduct a study in their schools, discussed the proposed study with the principals of these schools and then negotiated terms of access. This was in accordance with what Glesne and Peshkin (1992:33) suggest that if the study involves some sort of organisation, the researcher must first make contact with its *gatekeepers*, the person or persons who must give their consent before the researcher may enter a research setting and with whom the researcher must negotiate the conditions of access. The researcher informed the principals that not only the participation of the educators was required but also their (principals') participation was also required. The researcher explained to these principals that individual interviews would be conducted with them and the reasons for conducting individual interviews were also explained to them. Since the participation of the educators was also required, it was suggested that all educators should be orientated to the study first and then four to six educators in each school be solicited for the focus group interviews.

Also the issue of anonymity and confidentiality were discussed with all participants. The researcher assured all participants that their identities would be protected. This was in accordance with what Taylor and Bogdan (1998:34) suggest that the researcher should guarantee the confidentiality and privacy of the participants. Berg (2004:140) is, however, of the opinion that ensuring confidentiality is critical if the researcher expects to get truthful and free-flowing discussions during the course of the focus group interviews. If group members feel apprehensive or inhibited by fear of somehow being exposed, they will not fully disclose their feelings and perceptions. To ensure confidentially, every member of the focus group was made to sign a statement of confidentiality. In this case, as Berg (2004:140) put it, the agreement must be among all group members and the moderator/researcher.

4.3.6 Choice of participants

After the schools were chosen, the researcher approached principals of these schools for three reasons: to ask them for permission to do research in their schools; to ask them to participate in the study; and to ask them for access to the educators. Individuals who participated in the qualitative study are known as participants. Streubert Speziale (2003:23) maintains that the use of the terms participants or informants illustrates the position those studied in the research process.

The purpose of the study was discussed with these principals and they then introduced the researcher to the staff members. Although the researcher knows the majority of the staff members in all schools, school principals assigned one educator in each school who was to assist the researcher in terms of co-ordinating the participants. However, Glesne and Peshkin (1992:34) warn that gaining acceptance at the top is risky because others may feel ordered to co-operate. This may result in some would-be suitable (potential) participants not willing to participate. After the purpose of the research was explained to the educators, the researcher then requested between four to six educators to volunteer for the focus group interviews. Although in some instances educators were reluctant to participate, they eventually agreed to participate after the purpose of the research was explained to them.

The researcher also visited the KwaMashu Circuit Office in order to ask for permission to interview two Department of Education officials (superintendents of Education Management) who are responsible for the training and development of school principals and schools in general. Although the officials agreed in principle with the purpose and significant of the study, they seemed reluctant to be interviewed, citing their busy schedules as the main excuse. This led to each official referring the researcher to the other officials. Eventually, however, the researcher managed to get two officials to participate in the study. The researcher also visited the Regional Office in order to ask for two external evaluators (supervisors) who conduct whole-school evaluation in schools to participate in the study. The researcher approached two supervisors and requested them to participate in the study. Both supervisors approached agreed to participate in the study without giving the researcher any difficulties. Streubert Speziale (2003:25) is of the opinion that choosing the setting and participants appropriately will assist in developing a successful research study. Knowing how to access the site, knowing what to expect from those who are part of a particular

group and knowing how to most effectively develop a trusting relationship with those from whom the researcher intend to learn will support achievement of the research goals.

Therefore, the researcher also assured all participants that their responses would be treated with confidentiality and anonymity. According to Johnson and Christensen (2004:112), confidentiality and anonymity are important to avoid connecting the participants with any information that would be embarrassing and harmful. Likewise, Berg (2004:65) concurs and maintains that it is important to provide participants with a high degree of confidentiality.

4.3.7 Interview guide

According to Johnson and Christensen (2004:183), the interviewer enters the interview session with a plan to explore specific topics and to ask specific open-ended questions of the interviewee. Patton (2002:383) regards an interview guide as a list of questions or issues that are to be explored in the course of an interview. Rubin and Babbie (1997:390) are of the opinion that an interview guide lists in outline form the topics and issues that the interviewer should cover in the interview but allows the interviewer to adapt the sequencing and wording of questions to each particular interview.

Johnson and Christensen (2004:183) maintain that the interviewer should be flexible and should not have to follow the questions that are in the interview guide during the interview in any particular order. The interviewer can even change the wording of any questions listed in the interview guide. As Rubin and Babbie (1997:390) put it, the interview guide helps the interviewer to cover the same material and to keep focused on the same predetermined topics and issues while at the same time remaining conversational and free to probe into unanticipated circumstances and responses. Patton (2002:343-344) lists the following as the advantages of an interview guide:

- It ensures that the interviewer has carefully decided how best to use the limited time in an interview session.
- It helps make interviewing across a number of different people more systematic and comprehensive by determining in advance the issues to be explored.
- It is useful in conducting focus group interviews, as it keeps the interactions *focused* while allowing individual perspectives and experiences to emerge.

Therefore, in this study an interview guide was used to ensure that all aspects were included in the interviews. However, the interview guide did not dictate structure of the interviews and the participants were allowed to raise issues and/or expand on answers.

4.3.8 Data gathering and problems encountered

According to Le Compte and Preissle (1993:158), the complexity and variability of human life in its natural habitat mandates that those who study it must collect rich and diverse data on whatever they study. This necessitates that more than one data collection strategy should be used. Burns and Grove (2003:375) regard observing participants, interviewing participants and examining written text as the most common data collection methods used in qualitative studies. However, in this study the following data collection strategies are used:

4.3.8.1 Observation in schools

The researcher spent a number of days in each of the chosen schools observing what was happening in these schools. The researcher observes, among the other things, educators manning the gate in the morning, manning and conducting morning assembly, educators manning the playgrounds and learners playing during the break times, interactions in the classrooms, educators in the staff rooms during break times, as well during their free periods. Boys, particularly in secondary schools, were observed frequenting the toilets during the teaching hours. The researcher assumed that most of them went to the toilets to smoke. The educators who interacted with the researcher during the observation periods later confirmed this. Parents selling food, broken biscuits, sweets, juices etcetera at the gate were also observed.

During all observations the researcher would pose some questions to the educators whenever the time presents itself. The observations were recorded in writing during the observations and were checked and edited immediately after the observations. This was in accordance with what Johnson and Christensen (2004:188) suggest that it is a good idea to correct and edit any notes the researcher wrote down during an observation as soon as possible after they are taken because that is when the researcher’s memory is best. All activities observed taking place in these schools were regarded as a rich source of information. As Burns and Grove (2003:375) put it, in most cases the activities being

observed are routine for the participants. As a result they should form part of the data being collected.

4.3.8.2 Individual interviews with the Department of Education officials

Two Department of Education officials (superintendents of Education Management) who are involved in the training and development of school principals as well as educators in the new education policies, changes and curricula in KwaMashu schools were interviewed individually. Two other Department of Education officials (external evaluators/supervisors) who are responsible for conducting whole-school evaluation in various schools were also interviewed individually. These four officials were chosen because they were regarded as rich informants. McMillan and Schumacher (2001:402) regard this as using knowledgeable experts as participants.

All interviews with the four Department of Education officials were tape-recorded with the permission of the participants. The researcher also took notes during the interviews in order to supplement the tape-recorded data. These interviews went smoothly as all four officials interviewed were very co-operative. These interviews tool place in the offices of these officials and there was no interruption during all these interviews.

In total, four Department of Education officials (two superintendents of Education Management and two external evaluators/supervisors) participated in individual interviews. However, their characteristics are not discussed and/or given to protect their identity.

4.3.8.3 Individual interviews with school principals

The researcher also conducted individual interviews with two primary and two secondary school principals of KwaMashu schools.

The researcher and the participants agreed on times, dates and venues for the interviews. This was in accordance with what Streubert Speziale (2003:28) suggests that it is good practice to conduct the interview in space and time that is most comfortable for the participants. All interviews with principals proceeded without any problems. All principals showed interest in the subject, maintaining that the study was an eye-opener as the concept *whole-school evaluation* is a new

concept to them. Principals were interviewed in their offices after school hours. As a result there were no interruptions whatsoever and they switched off their cellular phones and also disconnected their landline telephones.

Interviews with these principals were tape-recorded with their permission and were later transcribed. Recording allowed the researcher to be actively involved during the interviews. The researcher also took notes during the interviews in order to supplement the tape-recording. Patton (2002:383) warms that the use of the tape recorder does not eliminate the need for taking notes but does allow the researcher to concentrate on taking strategic and focused notes rather than attempting verbatim notes.

In total, four school principals participated in individual interviews. The characteristics of these principals are discussed in more detail in chapter 5.

4.3.8.4 Focus group interviews with educators

The researcher conducted separate focus group interviews with four primary school educators from each of the two chosen primary schools. Two other focus group interviews were also conducted with four secondary school educators from each of the two chosen secondary schools. Thus, a total of sixteen educators (eight from the primary schools and other eight from the secondary schools) participated in four (two for the primary schools and two for secondary schools) focus group interviews.

All interviews took place at the time, date and venue agreed upon by the researcher and the participants. This was in accordance with Streubert Speziale's (2003:28) view that to facilitate sharing by the research participants, it is a good practice to conduct the interview in a place and a time that is most comfortable for the participants. The more comfortable each participant is, the more likely he/she will reveal the information sought. On the whole focus group interviews proceeded smoothly. Although educators in all schools were unwilling to be interviewed after school hours citing different reasons, the researcher managed to persuade them to have interviews after school hours. There were no interruptions at all as other educators and all learners had already left when these interviews took place.

All focus group interviews were conducted in English, as all educators (participants) were able to speak English. However, the vernacular, namely IsiZulu was occasionally used to clarify certain points. But after agreeing on that particular point it was again translated into English. The researcher is fluent in IsiZulu, as a result there was no need for a translator.

All focus group interviews were tape-recorded with the permission of the participants. The tapes were later transcribed. The researcher also took notes during the interviews in order to supplement the tape-recording.

The characteristics of the educators interviewed are discussed in chapter 5.

4.3.9 Transcribing the data

Transcription is the process of transforming qualitative research data such as audio-recordings of interviews or field notes written from observations into typed text (Johnson & Christensen, 2004:502). Transcripts are the main data of many interview studies (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:121). Thus, in order for data to be effectively analysed all taped interviews should be transcribed first.

Patton (2002:380) maintains that no matter what style of interviewing is used and no matter how the researcher words interview questions, it all comes to naught if the interviewer (the researcher) fails to capture the actual words of the person being interviewed. In this study the researcher transcribed all tape-recorded interviews verbatim immediately after the interviews had taken place. Patton (1990:349) is of the opinion that transcripts can be enormously useful in data analysis and later in replications or independent analyses of the data. Van Wyk (1996:164), however, warns that there is always the danger that transcribed words may loose some meaning as tone, volume, emotionality and accompanying facial and body gestures (body language) and disposition cannot be portrayed. Thus, a diary was kept to record many of these aspects during and immediately following both individual and focus group interviews. Patton (1990:351-352) contends that recapturing and conveying those perceived meanings to outsiders are innate to the nature of qualitative research at the point of analysis and writing.

4.3.10 Analysis of the data

According to Marshall and Rossman (1999:150), data analysis is the process of bringing order, structure and interpretation to the mass of collected data. It is a messy, ambiguous, time-consuming creative and fascinating process. Bodgan and Biklen, (2003:147) regard data analysis as the process of systematically searching and arranging the interview transcripts, field notes and other materials that the researcher has accumulated in order to enable him/her to come up with findings. Likewise, Patton (1990:371) regards the process of data collection not as an end in itself. Thus, data collected should be analysed, interpreted and findings presented.

In this research the data consist of the transcripts and notes taken during and immediately after the interviews as well as notes taken during and after the observation periods. In analysing the data the researcher initially read the transcripts and the notes repeatedly in order to gain familiarity with them. This was in accordance with what Marshall and Rossman (1999:153) maintain that reading, reading and reading once more through the data force the researcher to become familiar with those data in intimate ways. The researcher also listened to all recordings of the interview, at the same time checking the accuracy of the transcriptions. Streubert Speziale (2003:36) warns that qualitative researchers must *listen* carefully to what they have seen, heard and experienced to discover the meanings.

Data analysis is conducted to reduce, organise and give meaning to the data (Burns & Grove, 2003:46). Data analysis is a dynamic and creative process. Throughout analysis, researchers attempt to gain a deeper understanding of what they have studied and continually refine their interpretations (Taylor and Bodgan, 1998:141). Leedy and Ormrod (2005:150) maintain that there is no single *right* way to analyse data in a qualitative study. There are a variety of ways of handling and analysing data (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003:148). Likewise, Neuman (2000:418) concurs, maintaining that the wide variety in possible approaches to qualitative research is noticed by the many approaches to data analysis. Taylor and Bodgan (1998:140) agree and maintain that all researchers develop their own ways of analysing data. Van Wyk (1996:137) is of the opinion that although the analysis of data is complicated, it is a process that can be broken down into stages which may include the following:

4.3.10.1 Organising the data

The data generated by qualitative methods often result in voluminous notes from observation, interviews and/or documents (Best & Kahn, 1993:203, Patton, 2002:440). Thus, for the researcher to be able to analyse these data effectively, he/she needs to organise the collected data. Best and Kahn (1993:203) contend that the method of organising the collected data will differ depending upon the research strategy and data collection technique/s used. Berg (2004:37) concurs and maintains that how qualitative data are organised depends in part on what data look like.

It is almost impossible to interpret data unless one organises them (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:466). McMillan and Schumacher (2001:466) also maintain that qualitative researchers integrate the operations of organising, analysing and interpreting data and call the entire process *data analysis*. But organising all the data collected may be one of the most daunting tasks for the researcher. As a result the researcher started organising data immediately after data were collected. The researcher spent long hours organising the collected data.

4.3.10.2 Coding of data

McMillan and Schumacher (2001:467) regard coding as a process of dividing data into parts by a classification system. According to Burns and Grove (2003:381), coding is a method of indexing or identifying categories in the data. A code is a symbol or abbreviation to classify words or phrases in data. The process of coding involves bringing together and analysing all the data bearing on major themes, ideas, concepts, interpretations and propositions (Taylor & Bodgan, 1998:150-151). Strauss and Corbin (1990:57) describe coding as the operation by which data are broken down, conceptualised and re-compiled into new units. This process includes the following:

- Conceptualising of data. Strauss and Corbin (1990:63) regard *conceptualising* of data as the first step in analysis. Conceptualising means taking apart an observation, a sentence, a paragraph and giving each discrete incident, idea or event, a name, something that stands for or represents a phenomenon. Neuman (2000:42) is of the opinion that conceptualisation is one way that a qualitative researcher organises and makes sense of data. As Neuman (2000:420) puts it, the researcher in this study conceptualised or formed concepts as he read through and asked critical questions of data.

- Categorising of data. The next step of organising is seen as *categorising* which is the process of grouping concepts that seem to pertain to the same phenomena (Strauss & Corbin, 1990:65). McMillan and Schumacher (2001:461) contend that most categories and pattern emerge from the data, rather than being imposed on the data prior to data collection. This is the approach that the researcher followed in this study. Data were divided into topics or categories and this was done in order to make it easier to work with the data collected. The categories and subcategories were identified as natural themes, rather than on the basis of a prior category system. As categories and themes emerged, they were colour coded (Van Wyk, 1996:166).

4.3.11 Presentation of the data

A key issue in the presentation of the data is the inclusion of numerous examples of raw data and original discourse (Van Wyk, 1996:166). However, Lankshear and Knobel (2004:172) maintain that data is never *raw* in the sense of being natural items of information. Data are constructed by means of the collection process and shaped by what is collected and what is not. In this study the collected data are organised into readable, narrative descriptions with major themes, categories and illustrative case examples extracted through content analysis.

Bodgan and Biklen (2003:193-195) give examples of different ways in which the researcher can present the data. Each example of the raw data within the presentation helps to provide the opportunity for the researcher to gauge the level of validity of research data. As Van Wyk (1996:166) puts it, each issue, each inference and each tentative conclusion is supported by reference to one or more extracts form a participant's discourse. As far as possible, in selecting the quotes, the researcher has attempted to provide a balance of selections so that no participant is over-quoted or omitted.

4.3.12 Issues of reliability and validity in the present study

According to Neuman (2000:164), reliability and validity are important in establishing the truthfulness, credibility or believability of findings. Likewise, Best and Kahn (1993:208) maintain that reliability and validity are essential to the effectiveness of any data gathering procedure. Meanwhile, Patton (1990:11) maintains that the validity and reliability of qualitative data depends to a great extent on the methodological skill, sensitivity and integrity of the researcher. McMillan

and Schumacher (2001:250) maintain that reliability is a necessary condition for validity. Best and Kahn (1993:208) concur, adding, though, that reliability is not a significant condition for validity. That is, a test must be reliable for it to be valid but a test can be reliable and still not be valid.

One should attempt to improve the reliability and validity of the procedures but precise determination of the degree to which they are achieved is often illusive, particularly in the case of validity (Best & Kahn, 1993:208). Likewise, Neuman (2000:164) is of the opinion that perfect reliability and validity are virtually impossible to achieve. Rather, they are ideals researchers strive for.

Issues of reliability and validity applicable to this study are discussed below.

4.3.12.1 Reliability of design

Factors discussed by McMillan and Schumacher (2001:416-418) applicable to this research include the following:

- The researcher's role. The importance of the researcher's social relationship with the participants requires that studies identify the researcher's role and status within the group. This was discussed above (cf 4.2.1 & 4.3.2.2).
- Informant selection. Informants must be described as well as the decision process used in their selection (cf 4.3.6 & chapter 5).
- The social context influences data content and a description should be included of the people, time and place where events or interviews took place (cf 4.3.5 & 4.3.8).
- Data collection strategies. Precise descriptions must be given of the varieties of observation and interviewing as well as the way in which data were recorded and under what circumstances (cf 4.2.3).
- Data analysis strategies. Through retrospection accounts must be provided of how data were synthesised, analysed and interpreted (cf 4.3.10, 4.3.11 & chapter 5).
- Analytical premises. The conceptual framework must be explicit. In this case the researcher started by reviewing literature related to the topic. This was done in the preceding chapters. This was done in order to learn from and build on what others have done (Neuman, 2000:445). Creswell (2003:30) is of the opinion that literature review provides a framework for establishing

the importance of the study as well as a benchmark for comparing the results of the study with other findings.

4.3.12.2 Reliability in data collection

Bodgan and Biklen (2003:36) maintain that in qualitative studies, researchers are concerned with the accuracy and comprehensiveness of their data. Qualitative researchers tend to view reliability as a fit between what they record as data and what actually occurs in the setting under study, rather than the literal consistency across different observations. Mouton (1996:144) contends that the reliability of data is affected by the following: the researchers, experiments, interviewers or observers; the individuals or participants who participate in the research projects; the measuring instruments as questionnaires, interviewing schedules and observation schedules and the research context or the circumstances under which the research is conducted.

These factors can have a positive or negative effect on the reliability of the data collected. As a result qualitative researchers commonly use a combination of strategies to enhance reliability in data collected (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:407-410). Thus, in this research the researcher adopted the following to ensure that the data collected were reliable:

- Verbatim accounts. Verbatim accounts of conversation, transcripts and direct questions are used in this research.
- Low-inference description. Concrete, precise descriptions from field notes and interview elaborations were used when the data were analysed.
- Mechanically recorded data. A tape recorder was used during individual and focus group interviews to ensure accuracy.
- Discrepant data. Researchers actively search for, record, analyse and report negative cases or discrepant data. Creswell (2003:196) is of the opinion that because real life is composed of different perspectives that do not always coalesce, discussing contrary information adds the credibility of an account for a reader. This process was also followed in this study and no discrepant data was found.

4.3.12.3 Internal validity

The internal validity of a research study is the extent to which its design and the data it yields allow the researcher to draw accurate conclusions about cause-and-effect and other relationships within the data (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005:97). McMillan and Schumacher (2001:408-411) recommend the following to improve internal validity:

- Lengthy data collection period. This is said to provide opportunities for continued data analysis, comparison and corroboration to refine ideas and to ensure the match between research-based and participant realities. Creswell (2003:196) maintains that spending prolonged time in the field can help the researcher develop an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon under study and can convey detail about the site and the people that lends credibility to the narrative account. This research was conducted over a period of three months.
- Participant language. In this research participants were encouraged to relate their experiences and perceptions regarding whole-school evaluation and the role of the principal thereof in their own words, thereby contributing to the internal validity of the research. All interviews were conducted in English, as all participants were conversant in English. Occasionally, however, the researcher and the participants used IsiZulu to clarify certain points. But after agreeing on that particular point it was translated into English (cf 4.3.9.4).
- Field researcher. The participant observation and in-depth interviews took place in *natural settings,* all taking place in the school involved in the research. Interviews with the Department of Education officials took place in their offices.
- Disciplined subjectivity. Researcher self-monitoring, subjects all phases of the research process to continuous and rigorous questioning and re-evaluation. This was done throughout this research.

4.3.13 Triangulation

Triangulation refers to the use of a variety of methods and techniques of data collection in a single study (Best & Kahn, 1993:203; Mouton, 1996:156). This means it is better to look at something from several angles than to look at it in only one way (Neuman, 2000:124). As Carpenter and Jenks (2003:300) put it, confirmation occurs when researchers compare and contrast the information from different vantage points. Uncovering the same information from more than one vantage point helps

researchers describe how the findings occurred under different circumstances and assists them confirm the validity of the findings.

The use of multiple-data collection methods contributes to the trustworthiness of the data (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992:24). Patton (1990:245) agrees and adds that a multi-method, triangulation approach to the field increases both the validity and reliability of evaluation data. Likewise, Berg (2004:5) maintains that some researchers suggest that the important feature of triangulation is not the simple combination of different kinds of data but the attempt to relate them to counteract the threats to validity identified in each. Best and Kahn (1993:202) contend that all of the data collection techniques have strengths and weaknesses. Thus, triangulation helps to emphasise the strengths and minimise the weaknesses of the chosen data collection techniques. As Mouton (1996:156) puts it, the underlying assumption is that because various methods (data collection techniques) complement each other their respective shortcomings can be balanced out. By selecting complementary methods, a researcher can cover the weaknesses of one method with the strengths of another.

In this study the data collected have been triangulated in the following manner. Firstly, the data collected from focus interviews with educators from different schools were compared. Secondly, comparison of data from individual interviews with school principals from different schools was also made. Thirdly, the data collected from focus group interviews with educators and individual interviews with school principals were also compared. Fourthly, comparison of the data from individual interviews with school principals and individual interviews with the Department of Education officials was also made. Moreover, a comparison was made between the data obtained from individual interviews with the Department of Education officials. Comparison was also made between data obtained from the individual interviews with the principals, individual interviews with the supervisors, data obtained from the focus group interviews with the educators and the reports of the findings and recommendations of the supervisors that were submitted to schools. Also comparison was made between circulars and notes on whole-school evaluation, integrated quality management system and developmental appraisal system that are issued to schools by the Department of Education. This was done in order to validate statements made by various participants. Also the data that were obtained during the observations were compared with the data collected from the interviews.

4.3.14 Limitations of the study

According to Burns and Grove (2003:42), limitations are restrictions in a study that may decrease the credibility and generalisability of the findings. No proposed research project is without limitations; there is no such thing as a perfectly designed study (Marshall & Rossman, 1999:42). This was the case with this study. Numerous educational changes taking place in the South African context create a number of problems as various individuals interpret these changes differently. The present study does not claim to address all issues associated with whole-school evaluation in the disadvantaged schools, neither does it propose to isolate causes and effects.

However, this research aims at gaining some understanding of the complexity of the problems and issues and of the extent of the role of the principal in whole-school evaluation in the context of disadvantaged schools as experienced and perceived by the participants. In this way some of the gaps in the knowledge concerning the role of the principal in whole-school evaluation in the context of disadvantaged schools and/or communities can be filled.

4.4 SUMMARY

This chapter describes the rationale for the choice of a qualitative approach for the study of the role of the principal in whole-school evaluation in the context of disadvantaged schools in KwaZulu-Natal. It also describes the methods used to obtain the data, namely observations, individual and focus group interviews.

The chapter also covers the design of the research such as the selection of the participants, problems encountered in the field and the data analysis procedure. In the next chapter the data generated and analysed will be presented and discussed.

CHAPTER 5

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF KEY THEMES

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In previous chapters evaluation in general and whole-school evaluation in particular (Chapter 2), as well as the managerial role of the principal and schooling in disadvantaged schools/communities (Chapter 3) were discussed. In Chapter 4 the research methodology, the rationale for the choice of a qualitative approach for this research and the research design were described.

This chapter presents the data generated during interviews with twenty-four participants. This included individual interviews with four principals and four Department of Education officials, as well as four focus groups interviews with sixteen educators. Firstly, schools included in the research are discussed. The characteristics of the participants are summarised in Tables 5.1 to 5.5 and the significance of the experiences of the participants is discussed. All principals and educators teach in the KwaMashu Circuit and two Department of Education officials also work in the KwaMashu circuit, as superintendents of Education Management. The other two Department of Education officials work at the Provincial Office as external evaluators (supervisors). As a result they are directly responsible for whole-school evaluation. However, the characteristics of all Department of Education officials participated in this study were not included. This was done in order to protect their identity. It would be easy to identify these informants by looking at their personal information, as there are very few officials in the KwaMashu circuit and only a few officials (external evaluators/supervisors) at the Provincial Office.

The ensuing sections (5.4 to 5.13) present significant themes which emerged from the interviews. Interviews were conducted in English and occasionally the local vernacular, namely IsiZulu, was used to clarify certain points. But after agreeing on that particular point it was translated into English. The researcher is fluent in IsiZulu; as a result there was no need for a translator (cf 4.3.2.1 & 4.3.8.4). The researcher used the participants' words verbatim and no alterations were made to correct the language usage. Quotations are presented in indentations and any comments within quotations are indicated in brackets. All quotations are presented in *italics*.

5.2 SCHOOLS INCLUDED IN THE RESEARCH

Schools do not operate in isolation. They form part of the social structures that are found within communities and are, therefore, influenced by both the communities and the context of their environment. Therefore, to understand what is happening in the school, one needs also to understand what is happening in the community that the school serves (Mazibuko, 2003:59).

The researcher as a resident of KwaMashu Township is familiar not only with most of the community members and the surroundings but also with the activities taking place in the area. The researcher is also a deputy principal in one of the secondary schools in KwaMashu area (cf 4.3.2.2). As a result the researcher was not a stranger in the schools included in the research. The researcher requested and was granted an observation period by the chosen schools prior to the interviews. The researcher felt that the observation period in the chosen schools would enrich the individual and focus group interviews conducted with the participants.

5.2.1 The context of the schools

KwaMashu Township is situated North-West of Durban in KwaZulu-Natal Province. The township got its name from Sir Marshall Campbell, the former owner of the land, who was called “Mashu” (instead of Marshall) by the Africans in the area. KwaMashu covers an area of approximately fifteen square kilometers. The township is divided into fourteen units (sections). It is surrounded by informal settlements which mushroomed in the late 1980s and early 1990s. People who erected these shacks came from different rural areas, mainly to look for job opportunities in Durban and the surrounding business areas or as a result of faction clashes in the rural areas. Residents of the informal settlements mostly use schools, shops and other facilities belonging to the community of KwaMashu, since they have limited facilities.

There are 31 primary schools and 11 secondary schools and one school for learners with special needs. Presently, there is only one Further Education and Training College that serves the entire community of KwaMashu including the informal settlements. The township has one municipal library. The majority of its patrons are students attending higher education institutions. Very few school goers make use of the library. The library is, however, under-resourced. The township has very limited sport facilities.

The bulk of learners in schools in KwaMashu come from the surrounding informal settlements as most of the parents who are permanent residents in KwaMashu have taken their children to the former White, Indian and Coloured schools for better education. While there is a secondary school or two in each unit (section) most of the secondary school learners do not attend schools in the vicinity of their homes. These learners travel a long distance to and from schools by foot and/or use taxis which contribute to late coming. In most cases, taxi-drivers transporting these learners do not respect traffic signs and always play their music loudly in order to attract learners, as most learners, particularly girls, do not use taxis that have no sound system. Often learners wait for taxis that play music even if it means being late for school. In fact, most learners go to school very late and some of them also leave school very early on a daily basis. This contributes to the high failure rate in most secondary schools.

Most schools in the area are vandalised regularly. In some instances, resources that are meant to help learners, like computers, television sets, fax machines and photocopiers are stolen. At times criminals rob educators (particularly at primary schools) of their valuables such as cellular phones, watches and jewelleries. Criminals target primary schools, as they are mostly dominated by female educators. In fact, there are incidents where primary school educators have been hijacked and their vehicles stolen on the school premises in front of the learners. Although these incidents are always reported to the police at the KwaMashu Police Station and cases opened, frequently, no arrests are made. This encourages criminals to continue with their criminal activities.

5.2.2 The schools in the research

Four schools (two primary schools and two secondary schools) were chosen for this study (cf 1.8 & 4.3.4). Schools A and C are primary schools and schools B and D are secondary schools. Generally, all schools are well cared for. But in all schools not all classrooms are very clean. Some classrooms in all schools, but particularly in secondary schools, are very dirty. Although learners (both girls and boys) wear school uniforms, in schools B and D there is a tendency of not wearing full school uniform by some boys. These boys sometimes wear takkies instead of black shoes and black, navy or other colours instead of grey trousers. Learners in schools B and D have a tendency of coming to school late.

With regards to the facilities, the conditions vary. For example, school A has 22 computers, school B has two computers, school C has one computer and school D has 48 computers. All schools have land line telephones and fax machines which make it easier for them to communicate with the outside world. However, none of the four schools has *Internet*. As a result, learners and most if not all educators have no access to the *Internet* and are not exposed to what is happening globally. All schools chosen have, like most schools in KwaMashu area, basic facilities, such as classrooms, running water toilets, furniture (desks), although often these facilities are not adequate (4.3.4).

5.3 CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS

This section presents responses by participants that are related to their personal characteristics. Attention is also given to the experience of the participants in the education system, since participants may view whole-school evaluation in comparison with other old methods of evaluation, for example inspection that was conducted by the inspectors in the old days. The characteristics of the participating schools are summarised in Table 4.1 and should, therefore, be read in conjunction with the ensuing sections.

5.3.1 The school principals

Four school principals were interviewed in this study. Their personal characteristics are included in Table 5.1. The researcher feels that this information is necessary in order to understand the background of the participants in relation to their responses. It was also noted that all school principals who participated in this study are males.

Table 5.1 : The principals

Principals' characteristics	School A (Primary school)	School B (Secondary school)	School C (Primary school)	School D (Secondary school)
Gender	Male	Male	Male	Male
Age	48	47	44	52
Academic qualification/s	Matric	BA	Matric	B Com (Hons)
Professional qualification/s	PTD	STD and B Ed	SPTD	STD
Further field of study	None	None	None	None

Year of experience as educator	27	21	17	29
Year of experience as principal	5	5	6	10
General training for principalship	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Training course/s for WSE	None	None	None	None
Developmental programmes at school	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Who offers these programmes	SMT and Experts from outside	SMT and Experts from outside	SMT and Experts from outside	SMT and Experts from outside

Key :

BA : Bachelor of Arts
B Com (Hons): Bachelor of Commerce (Honours)
B Ed : Bachelor of Education
NA : Not Applicable
SMT : School Management Team
SPTD : Senior Primary Teachers' Diploma
STD : Secondary Teachers' Diploma
WSE : Whole-School Evaluation

School principals who participated in this study are all males who fall within the age group 44 to 52 and have seventeen or more years of teaching experience. They also have five or more years of experience as principals (Table 5.1).

According to the information given to the researcher, none of the principals have attended course/s on whole-school evaluation.

5.3.2 Educators

In total sixteen educators were interviewed in this study. Their personal details are included in Tables 5.2 to 5.5.

Table 5.2 : Educators at school A : Primary school

Educators' characteristics	1	2	3	4
Gender	Female	Female	Female	Male
Age	40	45	54	45
Academic qualification/s	Matric	Matric	Matric	Matric
Professional qualification/s	SPTD	SPTD	STD	SPTD
Further field of study	None	None	None	None
Year of experience as educator	17	20	28	21
Grade/s taught	6 & 7	7	5	5
Training course/s for WSE	None	None	None	None
Number of training courses for WSE	None	None	None	None
Who offered the training	NA	NA	NA	NA
How training was offered, e.g. cascaded	NA	NA	NA	NA
Developmental programmes at school	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Who offers these programmes	SMT and Experts from outside	SMT and Experts from outside	SMT and Experts from outside	SMT and Experts from outside

Key :

NA : Not Applicable
SMT : School Management Team
SPTD : Senior Primary Teachers' Diploma
STD : Secondary Teachers' Diploma
WSE : Whole-School Evaluation

In school A the focus group interviews included three female educators and one male educator who fall within the age group 40 to 54. All have extensive teaching experience. These educators teach various grades at their school. None of the educators have attended course/s on whole-school evaluation.

There are, however, some developmental programmes that are offered by the school to assist in the professional development of educators. These programmes are conducted by various individuals, for example, the principal, the members of the school management team as well as experts that are invited from outside.

Table 5.3 : Educators at school B : Secondary school

Educators' characteristics	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Gender	Female	Female	Male	Male
Age	44	37	39	56
Academic qualification/s	Matric	Matric	BA	Matric
Professional qualification/s	STD	STD	STD and BA (Hons)	STD
Further field of study	B Com (Incomplete)	None	MPA (Incomplete)	BA (Incomplete)
Year of experience as educator	19	14	16	31
Grade/s taught	11 & 12	8 & 9	12	10 & 12
Training course/s for WSE	None	None	None	None
Number of training courses for WSE	None	None	None	None
Who offered the training	NA	NA	NA	NA
How training was offered, e.g. cascaded	NA	NA	NA	NA
Developmental programmes at school	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Who offers these programmes	SMT and Experts from outside	SMT and Experts from outside	SMT and Experts from outside	SMT and Experts from outside

Key :

BA	:	Bachelor of Arts
BA (Hons)	:	Bachelor of Arts (Honours)
B Com	:	Bachelor of Commerce
MPA	:	Master of Public Administration
NA	:	Not Applicable
SMT	:	School Management Team
STD	:	Secondary Teachers' Diploma
WSE	:	Whole-School Evaluation

In school B the focus group interviews included two female and two male educators respectively who fall within the age group 37 to 56. All have many years of teaching experience. These educators teach various grades at their school. None of the educators have attended course/s on whole-school evaluation.

Although there are developmental programmes that are conducted in the school to assist in the professional development of educators, educators maintained that these programmes are not effective. These programmes are conducted by various individuals, for example, the principal, the members of the school management team as well as experts that are invited from outside.

Table 5.4 : Educators at school C : Primary school

Educators' characteristics	1	2	3	4
Gender	Female	Male	Male	Male
Age	32	38	42	42
Academic qualification/s	Matric	BA (Hons)	Matric	BA
Professional qualification/s	SPTD	SPTD	SPTD	SPTD
Further field of study	ABET (Incomplete)	Dip. in Marketing	None	None
Year of experience as educator	8	15	16	16
Grade/s taught	5	7	6 & 7	6 & 7
Training course/s for WSE	None	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of training courses for WSE	None	1	2	2

Who offered the training	NA	Dept of Education	Dept of Education	Dept of Education
How training was offered, e.g. cascaded	NA	Cascade model	Cascade model	Cascade model
Developmental programmes at school	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Who offers these programmes	SMT and Experts from outside	SMT and Experts from outside	SMT and Experts from outside	SMT and Experts from outside

Key :

ABET	:	Adult Basic Education and Training
BA	:	Bachelor of Arts
BA (Hons)	:	Bachelor of Arts (Honours)
Dept	:	Department
Dip.	:	Diploma
NA	:	Not Applicable
SMT	:	School Management Team
SPTD	:	Senior Primary Teachers' Diploma
WSE	:	Whole-School Evaluation

In school C the focus group interviews included one female and three male educators who fall within the age group 32 to 42 and whose teaching experience is from 8 to 16 years. These educators teach different grades at a primary school. Out of the four educators participated in this interview, three have attended whole-school evaluation training course/s and one has never been in a whole-school evaluation training course. According to those trained, the Department of Education officials offered these whole-school evaluation courses. Only a few educators attended the courses and they had to pass the information on to colleagues when they came back from the course. This is known as the cascade method. These courses/workshops took the whole day and educators had to leave learners unattended.

Table 5.5 : Educators at school D : Secondary school

Educators' characteristics	1	2	3	4
Gender	Female	Female	Female	Male
Age	41	37	41	34
Academic qualification/s	B Tech (Education Management)	BA (Hons)	BA (Information Science)	Matric
Professional qualification/s	STD & HED	B Paed	STD	STD
Further field of study	B Com (Incomplete)	Cert. (HIV/AIDS)	Cert. (HIV/AIDS)	None
Year of experience as educator	18	15	14	6
Grade/s taught	8, 10, 11 & 12	10, 11 & 12	8, 9 & 10	8, 9, 10 & 12
Training course/s for WSE	Yes	None	None	None
Number of training courses for WSE	1	None	None	None
Who offered the training	Dept of Education	NA	NA	NA
How training was offered, e.g. cascaded	Cascade model	NA	NA	NA
Developmental programmes at school	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Who offers these programmes	SMT and Experts from outside	SMT and Experts from outside	SMT and Experts from outside	SMT and Experts from outside

Key :

BA	:	Bachelor of Arts
BA (Hons)	:	Bachelor of Arts (Honours)
B Com	:	Bachelor of Commerce
B Tech	:	Bachelor of Technology
B Paed	:	Bachelor of Pedagogics
Cert.	:	Certificate
Dept	:	Department
NA	:	Not Applicable
SMT	:	School Management Team
STD	:	Secondary Teachers' Diploma

WSE : Whole-School Evaluation

In school D the focus group interviews included three female educators and one male educator who fall within the age group 34 to 41 years and whose teaching experience is from 6 to 18 years. Therefore, they are also familiar with the old method of evaluation which was inspection. Thus, they are in a position to compare the role that the principal played during inspections and the role that the principal plays or should play in whole-school evaluation. These educators teach different grades at a secondary school. According to the information that was given to the researcher, only one of these educators had attended a course on whole-school evaluation.

5.3.3 The Department of Education officials

Four Department of Education officials were interviewed in this study. Two of these officials are based at KwaMashu Circuit Office and are superintendents of Education Management. The term *superintendent* will be used throughout when referring to superintendent of Education Management. These two officials have many years of experience as educators, principals as well as superintendents. The researcher felt that they are relevant to this study and their input would be valuable as they deal directly with schools in their wards. More details have been withheld to protect the identity of these officials as was explained in 5.1.

The other two officials are based at the Provincial Office and they are at the Directorate of Quality Assurance. These officials are directly responsible for whole-school evaluation. They visit schools to conduct whole-school evaluation as external evaluators (supervisors). The researcher felt that their input in this study would also be valuable as these officials do the actual visits to schools and have first-hand information regarding what actually happens during the whole-school evaluation at different schools. These individuals conduct whole-school evaluation in schools that operate under different and unique conditions. However, more details have been withheld to protect the identity of these officials as was explained in 5.1. These two officials are referred to as *supervisors* in the text.

5.3.4 The significance of the experiences of the participants

As shown in Table 5.1 all principals have five and more years of experience as principals. This means that they are familiar with the changes that are taking place in the education system. These

changes come with new roles that school principals should perform in order for the school to realise its goals. Their experiences should not only put them in a better position to understand and know their new roles but also in an enabling position to perform these roles.

All principals have also been educators for a long period of time before becoming principals. Thus, they are familiar with the old method of evaluation in which schools were visited by a group of inspectors to conduct an inspection. Therefore, they are able to differentiate between the role that the principal played during the inspection days and the role that principals play or should play in whole-school evaluation as one of the new systems of evaluation. But these principals maintain that they never attended a single course on whole-school evaluation. This raises the question as to how these principals can understand and perform their role in whole-school evaluation effectively if they have never attended a workshop on whole-school evaluation.

All educators, with the exception of two have more that ten years of teaching experience. It is assumed that they are familiar with the old system of evaluation and they, therefore, can be in a position to determine what role the principal should play in whole-school evaluation. But the majority of educators maintain that they were not trained nor did they attend workshops on whole-school evaluation. According to some of these educators, they only learnt what would be required of them when their principals informed them that their schools had been selected for whole-school evaluation. All schools chosen for this study maintain that they offer developmental programmes to assist educators to develop professionally. Each school maintains that they conduct these programmes once a week and these programmes are conducted after school hours.

The Department of Education officials, namely superintendents, are well placed to understand the attitude and perceptions of both the principals and educators as they (officials) work closely with schools. They are in charge of respective schools in their wards. They are also responsible for the training and organisation of the workshops for both principals and educators. Thus, these officials should know not only the feelings of the educators in general and the principals in particular towards educational changes but also the roles that principals should play in ensuring that there is effective teaching and learning in their wards.

The Department of Education officials, namely the external evaluators (supervisors) were also thought to be valuable informants in this study as they actually visit schools for whole-school

evaluation. As a result they are in a position to observe the perceptions of both the principals and educators and their attitude towards whole-school evaluation. Supervisors interact with schools (educators and other staff members) as they visit schools to conduct whole-school evaluation. They should be acquainted with the role of every individual in the school before, during and after the whole-school evaluation. Moreover, these people conduct the evaluation and identify areas that need development. Thus, they are aware of the type of support each school needs. Moreover, their experience is significant because data obtained from them can assist in validating data obtained from the other participants, particularly principals and educators.

5.4 CHANGES TAKING PLACE IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN EDUCATION SYSTEM

South African education is undergoing transformation. As a result a number of policies that spell out new changes are being formulated (cf 1.4). According to Van Wyk (1998:13), prior to 1994 the entire South African education system, including education Departments, financing, and educator and learner bodies, was organised along racial lines. Following the April 1994 democratic elections, a non-racial education system based on the principle of equity was instituted, providing for central as well as provincial and local organisation of education. These changes introduced by the government, that is the political level, must be implemented by schools not only from different backgrounds but also operating in different contexts. Thus, the success or failure of these changes depends not only on how much the principal knows and understands the changes but also on how much the principal knows and understands the contexts in which his/her school operates. It also depends on how the change has been communicated to the staff and other stakeholders by the principal.

5.4.1 The benefits of educational changes to various schools

For any change to be effectively implemented it should be seen as beneficial by those that are to implement it otherwise, the implementers will resent the changes. Therefore, implementers should not only understand the change but also to know what they stand to gain or lose by the changes to be implemented.

Whilst all participants in the study support the idea of introducing educational changes in the South African education, they maintain that the benefits of these changes are sometimes reduced or lost

because of the tempo at which the changes are introduced. As the principal of school D puts it, "*The Department (the Department of Education) introduces change after change even before the previous change has been implemented and/or tested. This really creates problems*". Changes that are introduced too soon can demotivate people who are supposed to implement them and end up not achieving the intended objectives/goals. The principal of school C has the following to say:

> *For me most of these changes come too soon. As a result they come while most of us (the principals/educators) are not fully prepared for them. And the other problem is that programmes organised by the Department (the Department of Education) are too many. That is why even the Department has a problem of monitoring these programmes. In fact, what happens is that while you (the principals/educators) are busy with the programme the Department comes up with another programme. I really regard this as a trial and error approach adopted by the Department. Really, these changes neither benefit the educators nor the learners.*

Educators in this study do, however, acknowledge that changes in education are necessary given the changes taking place in society. However, they argue that the introduction of changes in education needs to be communicated clearly and implemented in a manner which would benefit education and society. Educators are of the opinion that changes are good given the history of education in South Africa. Thus, they believe that educational changes which are properly implemented can be beneficial to the schools as well as society. An educator in school B says:

> *Changes are also taking place in society as well. So, definitely the school would be affected by what is taking place in the society. I, therefore, feel that it is important that these changes (changes taking place in the education system) should take place because learners are our future leaders. But it is also important that these changes should be introduced in an orderly manner. Otherwise, they will not be beneficial, particularly to the disadvantaged schools and communities.*

Likewise, an educator in school D expressed his support of the changes taking place in the education system. He, however, raised his concern as follows:

> *Well, changes are good but the problem is that there are too many. The other thing is that after a particular change has been introduced there is no one to monitor whether that particular change is being implemented or not. And they do not check if that change is really helpful or is just a change that is meant to change from the old system of education.*

Although two Department of Education officials (the superintendents) concurred with both the principals and educators that there are too many changes and that these changes are confusing at times, they disagreed that these changes do not benefit the educators and learners and/or the education system in general. These officials maintained that there has been a great improvement in the system of education since South Africa became a democratic country. For example, South Africa has now a single national system of education. But the superintendents were of the opinion that some principals and educators are not comfortable with some changes which require them to alter their ways of doing things. As a result some principals and educators have a negative attitude towards changes and hence they felt that changes taking place in the education system are not beneficial to schools. As one superintendent put it: "*Some people (principals and educators) are opposed to some of these changes because they do not want to move out of their comfort zones*".

Discussion

For any change to be successfully implemented, the implementers should understand the essence of the policy and the perceived benefits thereof. Everard and Morris (1996:219-220) maintain that one of the reasons why implementing change often fails is that reformers function on a different level from that of the people affected by change. Thus, for any change to be successful, reformers should ensure that implementers and all other stakeholders who would be affected by such a change should understand how that change would affect them. Reformers should also ensure that implementers and other individuals develop a positive attitude towards that particular change.

De Clercq (1997b:144) is of the opinion that the problem with policies/changes introduced in South Africa is that they are borrowed from the advanced industrial countries, including Australia. Policies/changes tend to ignore the instructive experiences from societies in transition with similar socio-political democratic agendas and aspirations. As a result these policies/changes, including educational policies/changes, often fail to address the problems that they are intended to address.

5.4.2 Communicating educational changes to stakeholders

The manner in which changes are communicated not only to the implementers but also to all other stakeholders or people affected by the changes during the initial stages has a major effect on the implementation of such changes. Therefore, proper communication channels should be created so that information reaches all stakeholders in time and in a proper manner. Participants, particularly educators, maintained that educational changes are not properly communicated to them. They attributed this to the fact that there are too many educational changes and principals are expected to pass these changes to educators which the principals do not fully understand. Likewise, principals agreed that at times they pass information on to educators and other staff members that they do not understand. They maintained that they were not given enough time to read and comprehend these changes. The two superintendents who participated in this study also agreed that it is difficult to communicate so many changes in a short space of time; the officials sympathised with the principals and educators. One official summed this up as follows:

> *I really feel sorry for them (principals and educators) because they are the ones who should implement these policies even if they do not agree with them (policies). The problem is that they (policies/changes) are not well communicated to them. But they have to put them into practice.*

Educators maintained that their principals try their best to ensure that educational policies or changes are communicated to them (educators). But educators contended that the problem is that at times principals have difficulties explaining some changes to them. An educator in school C explained:

> *The principal mostly communicates education policies to us. We (principal and educators) discuss them in meetings. The problem is that even the principals at times fail to answer our questions because the Department changes now and then.*

This suggests that policies are not always well understood by educators who are supposed to implement them. This has a bearing on how these policies are to be implemented. Proper implementation depends on how policies are communicated to the stakeholders, particularly those who implement them.

According to one superintendent, at times educators get the information from their unions before principals get it from the Department of Education. This official maintained that unions are quick to convey the information to their members. It is really embarrassing when the principal gets the information from his/her staff before the Department passes it to him/her. The official expressed his feelings as follows:

> *It is important that principals should always be kept informed about whatever changes taking place. But my worry is that the Department is very, very slow in cascading information to us (officials). In most cases, unions get and also cascade the information to their members before us. As a result sometimes principals get the information after unions have already passed that information to their members. And by the time the principal tries to convey that information educators already know about that issue. This is a very embarrassing situation.*

The principal of school C also raised his concern about the fact that the Department of Education has a tendency of running workshops and briefing sessions parallel with the unions. Like the superintendent, the principal of school C was concerned about the fact that sometimes unions pass the information on to their members before the Department conveys that information to the principals. The principal of school C explained this as follows:

> *I think the other problem is that sometimes the Department runs some of the issues parallel with the unions. As a result educators end up getting the information even before you (the principal) give a report from the meeting that you have attended. I am talking about the meetings that are organised by the Department. So by the time you report to the staff members they look at you as a fool because you are telling them something that they already know.*

The other most important stakeholders or components in the education system are parents. Therefore, it is important that they should receive information on changes or new policies within education properly and accurately. However, participants in this study, particularly principals, raised concerns about the manner in which information on changes or new policies is communicated to the parents. It is very unlikely that any school can succeed without the support of the parents. As a result parents need not only understand the changes taking place in education but

also need to know what role they should play during the time of these changes. But all principals participating in this study maintained that they have a problem of communicating with the parents. Principals maintained that, in most cases, parents do not attend parents' meetings. According to these principals, parents' meetings are not fruitful because very few parents attend meetings. As a result most parents are not conversant with the changes taking place in the education system in South Africa. The principal of school A explained his frustration as follows: "*Really, parents have no interest in the education of their children. This is very frustrating because they (parents) end up not knowing what is happening at school*". The principal of school C concurred that they always invite parents to meetings in order to brief or update them about the changes taking place in education. The principal of school C had the following to say regarding the issue of parents:

> *We (the principal and the staff members) call parents' meetings but parents do no attend these meetings. According to the Department, we must have meetings with parents in order to inform them about changes taking place in the education system. The problem is that parents seem not prepared to work with us. Even if we call them to view their children's work at the end of the term very few of them would come to school. Really, this shows that they do not care about their children's work.*

Discussion

It is apparent that changes taking place in the education system in South Africa are often not well communicated to all stakeholders. This impacts negatively on the implementation of these changes since people cannot successfully implement changes that they do not understand well. As Mazibuko (2003:70) puts it, an important stage in the policy (change) process is the communication of policy (change) in a manner that will enable those who have to implement the policies to do so effectively.

According to Darling-Hammond (1990:240), policy must be clearly communicated if it is to be well understood. Meaningful discussion and extensive professional development at all levels of the system are critical components of such communication; directives are not enough. This suggests that communication channels need to be improved for any policy to be effectively implemented. Presently, there is poor communication between the Department of Education officials and the schools (the principals and the staff members) as well between the schools and the parents.

Conclusions on educational changes

Effective change calls for open-mindedness and a readiness to understand the feelings and position of others (Everard & Morris, 1996:220). Thus, for any change to be effectively implemented, the feelings, beliefs, ideas, experiences, assumptions and values of all those who would be affected by that change should be taken into account. No change of policy can be successful without the cooperation of the implementers.

Educational changes like in all other spheres are inevitable in South African context as the country is still addressing the legacies of the past. It is, therefore, important for the policy formulators to ensure that people affected by these policies/changes see the need of these new policies or changes. According to Department of Education (1996:17), changing South Africa's education and training system is only possible if there is harmony between the vision for transformation and the day-to-day realities of those working in the system. This is only possible if policy has been made meaningful to the people on the ground. As Rault-Smith (2004:46) puts it, real change cannot be imposed on people. Change needs to be a partnership process.

5.5 THE MANAGERIAL ROLE OF PRINCIPALS

The principal should perform his/her roles effectively in order for whole-school evaluation and other Departmental initiatives to be successfully implemented (cf 3.3). Roles and expectations are necessary to the functioning of institutions (Hoy & Miskel, 1991:33). Therefore, the managerial role of the principals to function effectively and improve the school should be clear to all stakeholders associated with the respective schools. Understanding of the role of each individual minimises conflicts that usually happen when people are unsure of their roles.

Principals are crucial in bringing about significant change in schools (cf 1.1). Therefore, principals should ensure that they perform their managerial role for the improvement of the entire school system. According to Mosoge and Van der Westhuizen (1998:78), to manage a school effectively, principals need to be both managers and leaders. This implies that the principal influences instruction and learning in the school whether he/she likes it or not (cf 3.2.1). Thus, the managerial role that principals play or should play especially during the times of change is critical for the schools to cope with changes taking place. As Mazibuko (2003:77) puts it, in times of policy

change (or changes in general), the principal has to ensure that teaching and learning takes place in the manner prescribed by the current policies. Thus, policy changes taking place in the South African education system require that the principal should perform his/her managerial role effectively for these policies to be implemented successfully. Van der Westhuizen (1991:4) argues that the question is no longer whether or not the principal has a managerial task, but rather how well he/she is equipped for his/her managerial task. Meanwhile, Hall and Hard (in Sheppard, 1996:326) maintain that the studies of principals, whether in the leadership studies, the studies of effective principals or the studies of principals as change facilitators, show that the principal is considered to be a prime factor in the process of change and school improvement. This shows that the role that the school principal plays in the school is always crucial.

5.5.1 The main responsibilities/duties of the school principal

According to Dimmock and O' Donoghue (1997:5), there is a need for a variety of studies which are aimed at understanding the various aspects of principals' work as part of current restructuring (cf 1.4). The principal occupies a unique leadership position and exercises influence in structural, operational and instructional matters in the school (cf 3.2.2).

For the school to function effectively, all stakeholders should know the responsibilities or duties of the school principal. All participants in this study had a common understanding with regard to the responsibilities or duties of the principal. These participants maintained that schools need strong and visionary principals, especially during these times of changes who would not only ensure that schools meet the demands and challenges brought by these changes, but who would also ensure that schools improve. All principals interviewed in this study maintained that they always have to ensure that everything in their schools run smoothly. All principals contended that they have to ensure that there is effective teaching and learning in their schools all the times. The principal of school D maintained that although he has to control everything taking place in the school, he does this with the help of other staff members especially the School Management Team (SMT). The principal of school B also regards control as one of the important duties of the principal. This principal had the following to say:

> *I have to supervise in order to ensure that each staff member not only knows what is expected of him/her but also to ensure that each member does his/her duty as*

> *expected. I also monitor if people (educators and non-teaching staff) go to workshops organised by the Department (the Department of Education) and/or by the NGOs (Non-Governmental Organisations).*

All educators feel that principals should ensure that their needs are fulfilled; they maintain that they need the support of their principals, especially because there are so many changes taking place in South Africa. But these educators maintained that it is not always easy for principals to provide that support because the Department changes education policies all the time. As a result principals sometimes pass information on them that principals are not quite sure of. The lack of funds also makes it difficult for the principals to provide adequate support to the staff members. An educator in school C explained: "*I think the principal should ensure that we (educators) have all the necessary resources so that we can perform our duties effectively. But the problem is that the school does not have funds*".

An educator in school A supported this. This educator maintained that it would be difficult for educators to perform their duties without the support of the principals. Principals should always be prepared to provide assistance and direction to the staff for the benefit of the schools. As an educator in school A put it:

> *The principal should ensure that our (educators') needs are met. For example, the principal should ensure that educators have all the necessary resources. So the principal should go out and look for these things. But I think I must say that this is not easy for the principal because the school does not have enough funds.*

The superintendents were also of the opinion that the principal has various duties to perform in order for the school to achieve its goals. According to these officials, successful schools are schools led by good principals. The principal should not only manage the curriculum but he/she should also manage all the resources, namely human, physical and financial resources. One official stressed that the principal should work closely with the deputy principal/s and the heads of the Departments. This official put it as follows:

> *The principal should see to it that the deputy principal/s and the heads of departments do their work. Basically, the principal should monitor if work is*

> *being done at school. What should happen is that the deputy principal/s and the heads of departments should monitor the work of educators and the principal should then monitor the work of the deputy principal/s and the heads of departments. In this case the principal just becomes an overseer.*

Both superintendents maintained that it is imperative that the principal works with the school governing body. These officials maintained that it is not easy for the school to be successful without the support of the parents. Moreover, the school governing body has a parent component so the principal should work closely with the school governing body. One official is of the opinion that the principal should not only give assistance and guidance to the staff members but should also do the same to the school governing body regarding the formulation and implementation of policies. The other official concurred:

> *The principal should also try to work closely with the school governing body. And if these components, I am talking about the deputy principal/s, the heads of departments and the school governing body work closely with the principal and* are *all actively involved in what is happening in the school, the work of the principal becomes much easier. But the principal should not dictate to these people. It is important that these people (the principal, the deputy principal/s, the heads of departments and the school governing body) should have regular meetings. But, my (official's) observation is that most principals do not conduct regular meetings at their schools.*

For whole-school evaluation to be effectively conducted principals need to perform their duties properly. Departmental initiatives, including whole-school evaluation, demand that principals should be more visible to the staff members, the learners, parents as well as other stakeholders. All educators in this study maintained that they need their principals for guidance, direction and support for them to understand and be able to implement not only whole-school evaluation but also other reforms. Likewise, the four principals in this study contended that principals should be available whenever they are needed. Principals maintained that they have a number of duties to perform in order for their schools to achieve their objectives. The principal of school D felt that because of a number of changes taking place in the education system, the principal's duties have become more complex and diverse. The principal explained:

> *Really, principalship is very demanding these days. As a principal, you have a lot to do. But the problem is that we are not at school all the times. We spend most of the time in meetings and workshops. As a result some of our duties are sacrificed.*

The two superintendents maintained that principals have to plan, organise and supervise the activities of all staff members in order to ensure that conditions are conducive for whole-school evaluation to take place. The principal of school B agreed, maintaining that one of his duties was to supervise and support the staff prior and during the whole-school evaluation. An educator from school A added, "*I think the other important duty of the principal is to keep us informed about the changes taking place in the education system*". Another educator in school C was of the opinion that the principal also has a duty not only to inform parents about whole-school evaluation but also to ensure that they support the school so that whole-school evaluation can be successfully conducted.

Discussion

The principal is responsible for a variety of duties pertaining to the effective functioning of the school. It is, therefore, imperative that principals should not only understand and know their responsibilities or duties but that they should have a clear understanding and knowledge of how to perform those duties so that their schools function effectively and efficiently.

All participants maintained that the principal should ensure that there is effective teaching and learning in the school. This is in accordance with Kruger and Van Zyl (2000:8) who maintain that the principal's main responsibility is to create conditions in the school in which learners can receive quality instruction both inside and outside the classroom. This is their main function; all their other responsibilities are subordinate. Effective schools researchers hold that a key element of an effective school is an effective principal (Whitaker, 1997:1).

Principals should be able, particularly during the times of change, to provide assistance not only to staff members but also to other stakeholders for the benefit of the learners. Principals should take responsibility and accountability for the participation of stakeholders in school management (Steyn, 2002a:255). Bradshaw and Buckner (1994:79) maintain that some principals seem to intuitively know how to create the kind of environment that facilitates the change process.

5.5.2 Understanding the managerial role of principals

For any principal to perform his/her role effectively, that principal needs not only to understand the role but also needs to know how to perform that particular role. It is also important that other stakeholders should know the managerial role of the principals for them (stakeholders) to be able to support him/her wherever and whenever necessary. There should be a common understanding of what the managerial role of the principal entails. But this was not the case in this study. Participants appeared to be uncertain about the concept *managerial role*. In fact, all participants felt uncomfortable when asked to describe the managerial role of the principal. Even principals who are supposed to perform this role are not sure what does the concept *managerial role* entail.

The principal of school A confessed that he was not sure of the meaning of the concept *managerial role*. This is how this principal expressed himself: "*Well, I would not lie. I am not sure what does this concept mean"*. The other principals also indicated that they were not quite sure of the concept. Likewise, all educators maintained that they did not know the meaning of *managerial role*. An educator of school C had the following to say:

> *Although I am not sure, I think it (managerial role) is about the role the person who manages an institution should play in order for that institution to achieve its objectives. But I must confess I have never heard of this term before.*

Another educator in school C like his colleague was of the opinion that managerial role is about the person who manages the institution. This educator explained: "*I am also not sure. But I think it is about the role that the manager plays in the institution. For example, there are things that the principal does when managing the school*".

In most instances, participants were very frank and confessed that they did not know the meaning of managerial role. In fact, most participants maintained that they were hearing the term *managerial role* for the first time.

Participants were unfamiliar with the concept *managerial role* and thus were unsure of the managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation. Principals, in particular, should understand their managerial role in the improvement of their schools. A lack of comprehension on

their part negatively influences the implementation of whole-school evaluation and other Departmental initiatives where sound management is required.

A superintendent defined the managerial role as the activity of controlling what is happening in the school. According to this official, the principal should control and know everything that is taking place in the school. "*I would say the school should be on the finger tips of the principal*", the official says. But this official was of the opinion that the managerial role of the principal is being challenged by the presence of a number of stakeholders. This official summed this as follows:

> *The principal has to deal with things that were not initiated by him/her but things that were imposed on him/her. For example, the Department expects the principal to do a number of things. The principal may, sometimes, have different feelings about these things. But he/she has still to do them as a manager whether he/she likes them or not.*

This could mean that some of the Departmental initiatives, including whole-school evaluation, may not succeed. For educators to develop a positive attitude towards these new policies, principals must lead by example. If principals are not certain of what roles to play for the new initiatives to be successful, educators and other staff members will be discouraged and reluctant to perform their duties.

Discussion

For the principal to be able to perform his/her managerial role effectively, it is crucial that he/she should not only have a clear understanding of the concept but he/she should also know how to perform that role for the benefit of the school. But in this study principals seemed to be uncertain about the meaning of the concept *managerial role*. The uncertainty can have a bearing on how the principals perform this role. Principals, in particular, need to be certain about their managerial roles otherwise they may perform their roles in a hit-or-miss fashion. This will result in the poor implementation of whole-school evaluation and other reforms.

Educators also need to know the managerial role of the principals because this knowledge is important for educators to understand what to expect from their principals. As Badenhorst

(1997:343) puts it, the principal is the most important and influential individual in the school. This decisive position encompasses a wide spectrum of complex functions pertaining to management and leadership. Therefore, all stakeholders should have a clear understanding of the managerial role of the principal. It is also important that all stakeholders know how the principal executes his/her managerial roles.

5.5.3 The impact of educational changes on the managerial role of the principal

School principals should be the people that educators look to for guidance, direction and support, particularly during times of change (Mazibuko, 2003:75). But school principals in this study maintained that they are sometimes unable to guide, direct and support staff members because of information overload. They often find it difficult to interpret policy changes which they have to communicate to staff members.

Both principals and educators interviewed in this study contended that educational changes frequently have a negative impact on the way in which principals perform different activities in their schools. Both principals and educators complained that principals spend most of the time away from their schools. For example, principals attend workshops, meetings and briefings as a result of the new changes. As a result principals end up not knowing exactly what is happening in his/her school. An educator in school A said: "*In our school, most of the things are done by the deputy principal because the principal is always away attending meetings*". The principal of school D agreed that he also relies on the deputy principals for the running of the school when he is away attending meetings and briefing sessions. This principal, however, also pointed out that there are things in the school that need his attention no matter what. Likewise, the principal of school B complained about the impact of these changes on his duties. This principal maintained that he is in favour of changes but his problem is that these changes take too much of his time. The principal of school B complained about the impact of changes on their daily duties as follows: "*The idea of introducing educational changes is really good. But the problem is that they keep us out of schools all the time. As a result when you return to school you find that there is a lot to be done*".

The principal of school C felt that educational changes have a negative impact on their long term planning. This principal maintained that they find it difficult to follow their programmes, as they

have to abandon their activities to attend meetings and/or workshops. This principal described the scenario as follows:

> *I think the problem is with planning. I would say the long term planning ends up not being properly followed. For example, you (the principal) plan at the beginning of the year all the things that you intend doing but we (principals) are called to meetings and workshops within a short space of time. As a result you (the principal) end up not doing what you have planned for that particular day or even weeks. So these changes really disturb your (principal's) focus on your long term planning*.

Meanwhile, the two superintendents were of the opinion that educational changes should have a positive impact on the managerial role of the principal. These officials maintained that the intention of these changes was to make schools better schools. So they felt that there should be an improvement in the manner in which principals perform their roles. For example, one superintendent maintained that these changes require the principal to become a member of the team. According to this official, principals are expected to follow a participatory management style. The principal should involve other staff members in decision-making processes. The principal should also delegate certain duties to other staff members instead of doing everything on his/her own. This, basically, implies that principals are expected to involve all stakeholders in whatever is taking place in their schools. This approach is new to most principals, particularly principals of disadvantaged schools. As a result most principals feel threatened by these changes. Sharpley (2004:57) is of the opinion that since school principals have been trained as educators, they find it difficult to cope with the new responsibility of management being placed on them. One superintendent summed it up as follows: "*Some principals feel that their powers have been minimised*".

Discussion

Educational changes taking place in South Africa have an impact on the roles performed by individuals associated with education, including individuals in the school environment. Policy changes change the way people do things and/or their behaviours. It is, therefore, important that everyone with interest in education should know how these changes impact on themselves.

Principals in this study maintained that they do not have time to deal with changes because they are always expected to attend workshops/training sessions and/or briefings. Principals should be given enough time to understand changes so that they would be able to communicate changes that they understand to other staff members. The principal has the critical task of helping the school and everyone associated with the school to adapt to changing circumstances. The success of local school initiatives depends upon principals' abilities to adapt their roles to new realities (Goldring in Murphy & Hallinger, 1992:81). The principal can only adapt his/her roles and influence others to adapt their roles to changing circumstances if he/she knows how the changes impact on his/her roles and the roles of others.

It is, therefore, important that principals should not only know their roles in whole-school evaluation but that they should also know what roles other stakeholders should play for whole-school evaluation to be successfully implemented. This can help minimise uncertainties among the stakeholders.

Conclusions on the managerial role of the principal

The principal as the head of the school performs a very crucial role for in the school. Therefore, it is very important that all stakeholders should know what role principals should play, particularly during the times of changes. Without this knowledge, staff members, parents/community members, learners and business may be reluctant to support the principal in his/her attempts to achieve the goals of the school.

However, the responses of the participants, including the principals revealed that the managerial role of the principal is not well understood. Principals in this study maintained that they are not sure of the meaning of the concept *managerial role*. This is a very unfortunate situation, as principals are the people on whom all staff members should rely. Principals should be certain of they are doing otherwise they can lead their schools into entropy (Mazibuko, 2003:79). Principals need to know how changes being introduced worldwide affect or change their roles. The success of local school initiatives depends upon principals' abilities to adapt their roles to new realities (Goldring in Murphy & Hallinger, 1992:81). Principals should be quite clear as to what roles they need to play so that whole-school evaluation, as well as other Departmental initiatives can be successful.

The next section (cf 5.6) focuses on the implementation of whole-school evaluation as it is being conducted in KwaZulu-Natal schools.

5.6 BACKGROUND TO WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION IN KWAZULU-NATAL SCHOOLS

Presently, whole-school evaluation is conducted in South African schools, including schools in KwaZulu-Natal Province. According to the external evaluators (supervisors) who participated in this study, the National Department of Education selects a number of schools to be visited for whole-school evaluation each year and then submits the list of those schools to the Provincial Departments of Education. Lists are then given to the supervisors who actually do the fieldwork.

However, participants in this study have different perceptions, experiences and attitudes towards whole-school evaluation. For example, the two supervisors who participated in this study maintain that they are unable to cope with the number of schools that is supplied by the National Department of Education. According to these officials the National Department of Education expects them to conduct whole-school evaluation in at least 3 000 schools a year in KwaZulu-Natal Province. But these officials maintain that the number of the supervisors is very limited. As a result they are unable to cope with the numbers given by the National Department of Education.

Although principals and educators who participated in this study support whole-school evaluation, they are concerned that nothing happened to their schools after whole-school evaluation was conducted. Both principals and educators of the four schools maintained that whole-school evaluation was conducted in their schools two to three years ago and the recommendations of the supervisors were submitted to the District Office. According to these individuals, there has been no communication between these schools and the District Office after the external evaluation. As a result principals and educators feel that whole-school evaluation in their schools has not been properly used as a vehicle that aims at making improvement in schools.

5.6.1 The purpose of evaluation

For any evaluation to be successfully conducted all those to be affected by it should have a clear understanding of its purpose/s. Without this understanding it would be difficult for various

stakeholders to support any form of evaluation. Therefore, individuals should be made aware as to why evaluation should be conducted and most importantly how it is going to benefit them (2.2.1).

All participants in this study agreed that evaluation is necessary in order to identify areas that need improvement. These participants maintained that it would be very difficult to determine if work is properly done in any institution without evaluation being conducted. As a result evaluation is necessary in order to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the individuals with an aim of making improvement where necessary. Basically, all participants were of the opinion that evaluation is conducted in order to make *improvement*. An educator in school C puts it as follows: "*The purpose of evaluation is to identify shortcomings with the purpose of making improvement*". Like other participants, the principal of school D stressed that evaluation should be conducted in order to check whether what the individuals are doing is being done properly or not. For example, if an educator teaches, he/she is developing learners, so he/she needs to keep on checking if he/she is being able to achieve the desired objectives. The principal of school D explained:

> *I look at evaluation as a process of checking whether goals are achieved and if not to check why they are not being achieved. But the intention is to make improvement all the times. So I would say we (principals and educators) evaluate in order to make adjustments and improvement where necessary. Really, without evaluation you cannot be able to see whether you are in the right track or not. Therefore, there should be some kind of evaluation.*

According to the participants, one cannot determine whether there is effective teaching and learning without having conducted evaluation. Therefore, evaluation is done so that gaps cannot only be identified but can also be filled or addressed. An educator in school A felt that evaluation should also be used to communicate with parents. According to this educator, evaluation is conducted in order to inform parents about the performance of their children in the school. Tests and/or examinations should be conducted and their results should be communicated to the parents. Without this information parents do not know how children are doing at school. This was also the opinion of an educator of school D who felt that parents should be always kept updated. This educator said: "*Parents should always be kept informed about the progress of their children. So we (educators) use evaluation to communicate with the parents*".

Meanwhile, one superintendent maintained that evaluation should be conducted in order to come up with a development plan. This official felt that it is difficult to compile a development plan without having conducted evaluation. According to this official, evaluation gives one a baseline of how things are before one can start making developments. The superintendent explained:

> *Evaluation helps you (the evaluator/s) to measure where do you want to be. So evaluation helps you to identify areas that need development. For example, you cannot say a particular person needs development without having evaluated his/her performance. Basically, evaluation helps to establish whether a person needs development or not and what type of development that person needs.*

Discussion

The purpose of evaluation is to inform future planning and, ultimately, development (Davidoff & Lazarus, 2002:84). All individuals to be affected by evaluation should have a clear knowledge of the purpose of evaluation for them to accept and respect the evaluation processes. For evaluation to be successful, it is important that stakeholders develop a positive attitude towards it.

In this study, all participants maintained that evaluation is necessary. Both principals and educators realised the importance of evaluation for them to develop and they all had a positive attitude to evaluation in general. This is in accordance with what Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:85) who suggest that staff members need to be aware of and committed to the purpose of the evaluation. In particular, the school needs to know how the evaluation will be utilised in the process of reporting and future planning.

Nevo (1995:7-8) warns that much as evaluation is viewed as a constructive tool for improvement and innovations, sometimes it is seen as a destructive activity which threatens spontaneity and paralyses creativity. Therefore, stakeholders should not only keep the purpose of evaluation in mind but should also ensure that their activities are directed at achieving this purpose.

5.6.2 Understanding of whole-school evaluation

In order for whole-school evaluation to be successfully conducted, all stakeholders should not only have a clear understanding of this *concept* but should also know the role that each stakeholder needs to perform. Stakeholders should also know why it is necessary that the school should be evaluated as a whole. The school principal as the head of the institution should play a leading role in ensuring that everyone at school understands whole-school evaluation as well as its implications. However, the principal cannot be in a position to do so if he/she also does not fully understand the implications of whole-school evaluation.

Generally, all participants have a common understanding with regard to whole-school evaluation. According to the participants, whole-school evaluation is used in order to check if the school as a whole is functioning properly. The principal of school B regards whole-school evaluation as a vehicle that should be used in order to assess whether the school is achieving its objectives or not. Thus, the school should use whole-school evaluation to identify areas where it needs improvement as well as areas where the school feels it is doing well. The principal of school B says: "*Basically, I would say whole-school evaluation should be used to check what needs to be improved and how*".

The principal of school A is of the opinion that whole-school evaluation is about evaluating everything in the school. Thus, internal, particularly external evaluators should look at everything that takes place in the school. The principal of school A summed this up as follows: "*They (external evaluators) leave no stone unturned*". Likewise, educators at school C regarded whole-school evaluation as a type of evaluation that looks at or evaluates the school as a whole. These educators feel that whole-school evaluation looks at what is happening in the school both inside and outside the classroom. One educator in school C explained:

> *Whole-school evaluation looks at everything in the school. For example, when the supervisors came here they observed us (educators) teaching, they checked our files, they interviewed some of us (educators), a few learners and a few parents and they also watched learners playing during the break time.*

The educator in school C added: "*They (the supervisors) also spent time with the principal. Although I am not sure what they were doing there, I think they were also checking the principal's files"*.

According to an educator in school B, whole-school evaluation focuses on checking whether there is quality education in a particular school or not. This educator maintained that in the past the emphasis was on what educators were doing but the conditions under which the educators were teaching were not taken into account. Thus, whole-school evaluation looks at what is happening in the school as a whole. Although the principal of school D agreed that whole-school evaluation aims at improving the quality of education, most educators are negative towards it. According to this principal, some educators look at the external evaluators like the inspectors in *disguise*. The principal of school D said: "*So educators think external evaluators come to school to inspect them (educators)*". This confirms Potterton's (2004:70) view that the supervisors were soon dubbed "*scorpions*", thus framing them in a police-like role.

According to the principal of school C, whole-school evaluation looks at the conditions of a particular school with the aim of making improvement where necessary. This principal maintained that schools are at different levels of development and policy formulators should take this into account. One of the supervisors in this study concurred that whole-school evaluation takes the context of each school into consideration. According to this supervisor, they look at each school holistically and they consider its unique conditions. "*Schools are not the same, so we have to take that into account when we conduct whole-school evaluation*", the supervisor said. Another supervisor concurred that whole-school evaluation should be understood and conducted with the context of each school in mind but this supervisor points out that schools should not take advantage of that. This supervisor contended that each school should always try to provide quality education.

Discussion

All participants in this study have a common and general understanding of the concept *whole-school evaluation*. Generally, both principals and educators see the need of whole-school evaluation to be conducted in the school for the development and improvement of the school.

Clear understanding of whole-school evaluation and its implications can lead to proper implementation. But the study reveals that participants, particularly principals and educators, had only a general understanding of whole-school evaluation, as they had not undergone training. This implies that principals and educators do not really understand the pros and cons of whole-school evaluation. Because of this shortcoming, schools cannot conduct whole-school evaluation effectively. According to Oliphant and Tyatya (2004:34), the main purpose of whole-school evaluation is to facilitate improvement of school performance through approaches characterised by partnerships, collaboration, mentoring, guidance and support. It enables a school and external supervisors to provide an account of the school's current performance and to show the extent to which a school is able to meet the needs of the community and public in general.

For whole-school evaluation to be conducted successfully, all individuals affected by it should have a comprehensive understanding of it. People should know what they themselves and the school would gain after conducting whole-school evaluation. Moreover, external evaluators need not only to understand whole-school evaluation but also need to understand contexts in which it is conducted. However, Jansen (2001: 560) argues that the fact that all educators or learners or schools are required to attain the same levels of achievement (standardised performance), irrespective of background (context) implies that whole-school evaluation does not take the context of schools into consideration.

5.6.3 Training offered in whole-school evaluation

Only four out of sixteen educators interviewed in this study had received training in whole-school evaluation. Meanwhile, none of the four principals interviewed received training in whole-school evaluation. From school C two educators attended two workshops and one educator attended only one workshop in whole-school evaluation. Meanwhile one educator from school D received training in whole-school evaluation. This educator attended only one workshop in whole-school evaluation. This is unacceptable given the fact that educators play or should play a very significant role in whole-school evaluation.

According to educators who participated in this study from school A and B, the only information they received in whole-school evaluation was through briefings from their principals prior to the school self-evaluation as well as when they were preparing for the external evaluation. These

educators, however, contend that the information given to them by their principals was limited, as these principals too did not receive any training in whole-school evaluation. Principals from the four schools agreed that they had undergone no training in whole-school evaluation. These principals maintained that the only information they received on whole-school evaluation was through the team leaders before whole-school evaluation was conducted in their schools. This is a disturbing scenario considering that principals should provide guidance and support to the educators, other staff members, parents, and other stakeholders, including the learners, to some degree, particularly during the times of changes. A principal who is not well informed about changes taking place cannot provide proper guidance, direction and support to his/her staff members and other stakeholders. This can have a negative impact on the achievement of the school's intended goals and objectives. The principal of school B had the following to say: "*No. We (principals) did not receive any training in whole-school evaluation*".

But the two supervisors (external evaluators) in this study disagreed with principals and educators that there were no training courses or workshops on whole-school evaluation. According to these officials, workshops on whole-school evaluation had been conducted throughout the whole Province of KwaZulu-Natal. These officials maintained that these workshops were organised by the Department of Education for both the principals and educators. Supervisors maintained that in these workshops they had explained to principals and educators the purpose of whole-school evaluation as well as its implications. Supervisors maintained that they conducted these workshops so that principals and educators should have a clear understanding of whole-school evaluation before starting the whole process. According to these supervisors, it was important that schools should know how should they conduct internal evaluation and also know what supervisors expect from schools during the external evaluation. Thus, supervisors could not understand how principals and educators could claim that they were not trained or workshopped on whole-school evaluation. One of the two supervisors explained: "*We (the supervisors) wanted to ensure that schools (principals and educators) are well-prepared when we visit them*".

Schools and the two supervisors who participated in this study gave conflicting statements regarding reasons why most educators and principals did not attend the training in whole-school evaluation. For example, all principals maintained that they did not receive the invitations. But the four educators who attended training maintained that they did receive invitations directed at them for the workshops from the Department (their Circuit Office and/or District Office). According to

the four educators who attended the workshops, none of the invitations stipulated that principals should also attend the training/workshops. Meanwhile, the supervisors were adamant that invitations were sent to the Circuit Offices and according to their knowledge, Circuit Offices sent these invitations to schools. Therefore, schools could not claim that they did not receive the invitations. Principals and educators, however, contended that it is not uncommon that some schools at times do not receive invitations for meetings and workshops from the Department. They maintained that at times they receive invitations on the day of the meeting or workshop. The principal of school D stated as follows:

> *At times, you (the principal) get a telephone call from your colleague asking or telling you about the meeting or a workshop. Sometimes we get telephone calls from the Circuit Office telling or reminding us about the meeting or workshop on the day of a meeting.*

An educator in school B concurred that sometimes the principal would call an educator during the middle of the lesson after receiving a telephone call from the Circuit Office informing him about the meeting/workshop that is already in progress. As a result the educator has to leave the class during the middle of the lesson to attend to the meeting/workshop that was not communicated to him/her in time. Another educator confirmed this:

> *This is very frustrating. It is even worse for those educators who do not have cars because they have to go to their colleagues to ask them to drive them to the meeting or workshop. You (the researcher) know, most of us do not have cars. So we rely on friends when we are told to attend a meeting at the eleventh hour.*

All principals in this study maintained that they were well briefed by the team leaders (external evaluators) prior to the whole-school evaluation. As a result they understood what would happen at their schools during the whole-school evaluation (external evaluation). Principals then cascaded the information to their educators and other staff members so that everyone was brought on board. Likewise, one supervisor agreed that the team leader first communicates with the school before the team of external evaluators visits the school. According to this supervisor, the team leader informs the school that it has been selected for whole-school evaluation and then negotiates for the dates for the on-site evaluation and other related logistics. This supervisor explained: "*The team leader*

explains to the school (the principal) what the team (the supervisors) would expect from the school during our visit".

The principal of school C maintained that their school is involved in a programme co-ordinated by a Non-Governmental Organisation. According to the principal, the programme is similar to whole-school evaluation. The principal maintained that the programme helped the staff members not only to understand their weaknesses but also to know how to address them. As a result by the time whole-school evaluation was conducted the school had managed to address some of the areas that needed attention. The principal of school C explained this as follows: "*Whole-school evaluation came with the very same idea that we have learned from this programme*".

The principal of school D contended that most educators have a negative attitude towards whole-school evaluation. This can be attributed to the fact that most educators have not been trained on whole-school evaluation and may not fully appreciate the significance of whole-school evaluation in schools. Lack of understanding and knowledge impede most educators from fully participating with the supervisors during the external evaluation. The principal of school D said: "*Educators fail to understand that supervisors come to the school in order to assist them (educators) to improve where there is a need for improvement*".

Discussion

For any policy to be implemented successfully, it is important that all implementers should undergo training which would enable them to understand what is actually expected of them. At school level, proper training should be given to the principals as they monitor the implementation of the policies.

The external supervisors interviewed in this study maintained that principals and educators were trained in whole-school evaluation. However, all principals and the majority of the educators maintained that they had not been trained. This shows that not all is well in schools with regard to whole-school evaluation. England (2004:18) argues that while the Department of Education is ultimately responsible for the training and development of principals and educators, the Department has limited capacity and the need is too great. Therefore, the Department needs to contract the service providers in order to assist it.

5.6.4 The attitude of schools towards whole-school evaluation

The attitude of the people to be affected by any policy or reform has a great impact on the implementation of that particular policy or reform. Thus, for whole-school evaluation to succeed all stakeholders, particularly principals and educators should develop a positive attitude towards it. As Potterton (2004:71) puts it, the whole-school evaluation will only be successfully if educators and principals have a positive attitude towards it, towards the supervisors and towards the roles that principals and educators are supposed to play during its implementation.

According to participants in this study, principals and educators have different attitudes towards whole-school evaluation. Both principals and educators maintained that this can be attributed to the fact that some did not receive any training and/or not adequately trained in whole-school evaluation. However, principals and educators added that the attitude towards whole-school evaluation depends on the individuals. According to them, some people see the need of this type of evaluation. They maintained that those who have a positive attitude towards whole-school evaluation have developed this attitude because they understand its purpose to improve the quality of teaching and learning. They also added that some people support whole-school evaluation because they know that in order for the school to improve, everything in the school need to be evaluated first before improvement is attempted. An educator in school D contended that some educators, however, see whole-school evaluation differently. As a result these individuals have developed a negative attitude towards it. This educator put it as follows: "*You (the researcher) must remember that whole-school evaluation involves a lot of work, so certain individuals have a negative attitude towards it because they do not want to work*".

Another educator in school D was of the opinion that all schools should have a positive attitude towards whole-school evaluation if they want to improve. This educator also added that schools should not actually wait for people from outside because schools know what needs to be improved. This educator explained:

> *When the supervisors came here I began to question myself if there is really any need for us to wait for people (external evaluators) from outside to do the work that we should be doing. Well, there are certain things that we cannot be able to do. But as an educator I know what is expected of me. So if I do not do that it is*

> *not because I do not know what I should do but it is because I do not want to do it. For me their (supervisors) coming was not a big issue because I know what I am expected to do as an educator. I think the people who had a problem with the supervisors were those that do not do their work.*

The principal of school A confirmed this, maintaining that people who had a problem with the whole-school evaluation and/or external evaluators were behind with their work. These people had to update their work within a short space of time. As a result they got frustrated when they learnt that external evaluators would be visiting their schools because there was work to do before the external evaluators arrived. The principal of school B agreed but said this should not be the case. Schools should see whole-school evaluation as another vehicle that aims at helping them to improve. "*We should see it (whole-school evaluation) as an attempt to help us (schools/educators) improve*", the principal of school B said.

Meanwhile, the two supervisors interviewed in this study gave two conflicting versions regarding the attitude of the schools towards whole-school evaluation. One supervisor maintained that the attitude of schools differs. According to this supervisor, a number of factors determine the type of attitude that schools would have on the whole-school evaluation and/or the external evaluators. This supervisor explained: "*At some schools they (the staff members) do not even want to see us (supervisors). But at other schools they welcome us with both hands*". This supervisor, however, adds that, in most cases, in schools where educators have a negative attitude towards the whole-school evaluation and the supervisors, principals use whole-school evaluation to threaten educators. These principals create an impression that whole-school evaluation is there to punish educators who do not do their work effectively. An educator in school A confirmed that most principals use whole-school evaluation to threaten them if things are not going well in the school. As a result by the time the external evaluators come to the school to conduct the whole-school evaluation educators have already developed a negative attitude towards the external evaluators. According to one of the supervisor interviewed, the other thing that creates a negative attitude towards whole-school evaluation and/or supervisors, especially among the educators, is that most educators do not want to be observed when teaching. This supervisor summed this up: "*They (educators) really do not want us (supervisors) in their classes. They do not want us to see what they are doing in the classroom*".

Whilst one supervisor maintained that the attitude of schools towards whole-school evaluation and/or supervisors varies, the other supervisor maintained that the attitude during the first day is always negative. This supervisor is of the opinion that schools associate the external evaluators with that old system of evaluation where schools were visited by inspectors. However, this supervisor maintained that in most cases the attitude of schools changes as days go by and schools (staff members) become familiar with the supervisors. According to this supervisor, most schools start cooperating with them (supervisors) during their second or third day at school. This supervisor insisted:

> *Really, I have never been well accepted on the first day at any school. I am talking here about all schools, including the former Model C schools. Wherever we (supervisors) go on the first day we get a lot of questions. For example, why it was our school that was selected out of all the schools in the Province. In some instances, they (schools) would flatten the tyres of our cars.*

This supervisor elaborated on the attitude of schools, maintaining, for example, that the former Model C schools tend to act as if superior. According to this supervisor, some former Model C schools even try to check the credentials of the supervisors. Moreover, some Model C schools query why external evaluators want to check their schools when they produce good results. They maintained that supervisors should go to the former Black schools where grade twelve results are bad. "*Basically, they (the former Model C schools) have a tendency of trying to dictate to us (supervisors) how we should do our work*". Meanwhile, according to this supervisor, the former Indian schools always try to impress the supervisors. According to this supervisor, most of the former Indian schools pretend they appreciate the supervisors' visit. The supervisor maintained that most of the time they could see that they are not welcome in these schools. The supervisor described this scenario as follows: "*Most of the time they would try to show us even things that we did not ask from them*".

According to this supervisor, in former Black schools educators would always come with a number of problems. The supervisor maintained that educators always try to explain to them what is happening in the school even before the supervisors start their work. Principals would tell the supervisors his/her problems about the educators and educators would also report a lot about the principal to the supervisors. The supervisor said: "*I would say in most former Black schools they*

(principals and educators) always want us to have preconceived ideas about the school before we start the evaluation".

According to this supervisor, most of the former Coloured schools show them on the first day that they are not concerned about their presence. According to the supervisors, these schools continue operating as if nothing has happened. The supervisor explained this as follows: "*You could see that these people do not care a damn*".

Discussion

People always respond differently to any change or policy being introduced. Some people may respond positively while other may respond negatively. The response of the people towards change or policy determines the success or failure of that particular change. For example, if people have developed a negative attitude towards change or policy, they are likely to resist it; if they have a positive attitude towards a particular change they are likely to support it. Therefore, for whole-school evaluation like any other changes to be effectively implemented, implementers' attitudes have to be positive. Therefore, all stakeholders should not only be involved at the initial stages of the change but should also see the need for change.

The role of the principal then becomes crucial more especially when changes are being introduced because staff members tend to develop mixed feelings towards the changes. However, Everard and Morris (1996:175) warn that there is no simple formula for building a positive ethos within the organisation (the school). It is less likely to be achieved through a dramatic programme than by a consistent attitude and a series of carefully planned steps.

5.6.5 The role of the supervisors during the whole-school evaluation

The role of the supervisors (external evaluators) should be spelt out to all staff members as well as to the parents and other stakeholders. The staff members and the parents and other stakeholders should know what the supervisors would expect during their visit/s. Understanding the role of the supervisors can, to some extent, minimise the animosity that is normally created by their presence in the school.

According to the supervisors interviewed in this study, they work as a team and the team consists of a monitor, a team leader and other team members who are ordinary supervisors. The number of other members is determined by the size of the school but is usually between three and five. The members of the team perform different roles. For example, the team leader firstly informs the school that it has been selected for whole-school evaluation and then negotiates the dates of visit for the on-site evaluation. These supervisors also maintained that the team leader explained to the school what the team would expect from the school during the day/s of visit. As one supervisor put it: "*Basically, the team leader links us (the supervisors) with the school to be visited*". Then the other team members come to the school on the day for the evaluation. Supervisors are responsible for checking that everything in the school is in proper order. Another supervisor said: "*As a supervisor, I get certain focus areas that I have to check. For example, if I were to look for the basic functionality of the school, I look at certain policies like lateness et cetera*".

According to the supervisors, supervisors check if the school functions properly. For example, they check if educators and learners spend the normal hours at school. They also check if educators do their work properly and effectively. They do this by conducting class visit and checking learners' work in order to establish what is happening in the classroom. The behaviour of learners also becomes part of their observation. Basically, the role of the supervisors is to check if all role-players in the school perform their roles effectively. One supervisor explained: "*We even interview some parents in order to determine if parents are playing any role in the school*".

Meanwhile, the monitor monitors the work of the supervisors. According to the supervisors who participated in this study, the monitor monitors if the supervisors follow the policy and checks if they are doing the work as expected. He/she also sees to it that they (supervisors) follow their code of conduct. These supervisors maintained that the monitor does not come to the school being evaluated everyday. The monitor comes once and his/her role is to check the side of the supervisors and the side of the school. Basically, the monitor checks if the supervisors do their work as expected and also checks if the school is co-operating with the supervisors. Thus, the monitor is there to check the relationship between the external supervisors and the staff members. He/she does this by conducting interviews with the principal as well as with staff members in order to check if the process (whole-school evaluation) is running smoothly. Moreover, he/she also checks with the team leader to confirm what he/she has been told by the principal and the staff members. As one supervisor put it: "*The monitor is a middle person between the school and the external evaluators*".

Discussion

For the whole-school evaluation to be successful supervisors should be well informed and schools should have trust and respect for the supervisors. Supervisors who have no integrity cannot earn the respect and trust of the schools. This can impact negatively on the implementation of whole-school evaluation.

Potterton (2004:71) is of the opinion that whole-school evaluation has been set up to fail because of, among others, there are not enough supervisors; supervisors do not have the highest level of training with more than adequate knowledge of curriculum issues. It is, therefore, essential that supervisors should know their roles in whole-school evaluation thoroughly so that they can be able to conduct whole-school evaluation effectively. As Potterton (2004:71) puts it, supervisors need to be extremely diligent in schools and base their findings on real evidence.

5.6.6 The role of the principal in whole-school evaluation

All participants in this study agree that the role of the principal is always crucial in whatever activity is taking place in the school. The principal should be the person that all staff members, learners and parents, including other stakeholders look to not only when there is a critical issue in the school but also for guidance, direction and support. The principal also acts as a link between the school, the staff members, the parents/community and the Department of Education. In fact, the principal represents the Department of Education at school level. As a result the principal should not only ensure that all staff members, parents and other interested parties understand all policies/changes introduced by the Department but also that staff members, parents and other interested parties play their respective roles effectively for the benefit of the school and the learners. The principal should, therefore, not only communicate the departmental policies to the school but should also monitor that these are properly implemented.

Thus, the principal has a very important role to play in whole-school evaluation just like in all other Departmental policies and communications with the schools. But two out of the four educators interviewed in school A were reluctant to express themselves when asked about the role of the principal in whole-school evaluation. It appeared as if they did not want to commit themselves in this issue. One of these educators at school A stated:

> *I can't answer that question. Really, I can't say what the role of the principal in whole-school evaluation is. In fact, I was not even sure what these people (external evaluators) were here for. I only realised later that they were here not to look for faults but just to find out how they can assist us in doing our work effectively. But to my surprise these people never came back.*

What was said by this educator does not only suggest that some educators are not sure of the principal's role in whole-school evaluation but also suggests that some educators are not clear about the role of the external evaluators. The educator's answer suggests that he was not aware that the external evaluators (supervisors) only conduct the evaluation but they do not make any follow-up. Assistance is or should be provided by the District Office and other components of the Department of Education but not by the supervisors. Supervisors together with the schools only identify areas that need improvement.

In all fairness, most educators interviewed in this study maintained that the role of the principal is to support them (educators and other staff members). These educators were of the opinion that their principals should make sure that they have all the necessary resources so that they can perform their duties. An educator in school C said: "*The principal should ensure that everything is in order before the supervisors come to the school*". This was supported by an educator in school D who maintained that the principal should ensure that all staff members understand the concept *whole-school evaluation* and its implications for the school and all individuals associated with the school. Meanwhile, one educator in school D maintained that the principal should also ensure that the recommendations made by the supervisors are attended to. The principals should also check that the district also attends to the recommendations that have been submitted to them. All educators were of the opinion that the principal has an important role to play in whole-school evaluation before, during and after the whole-school evaluation has been completed in the school. Educators expect their principals to ensure that everyone in the school is well prepared and ready for the whole-school evaluation. An educator in school A said: "*He (the principal) should make all the information about whole-school evaluation available to us*". Another educator in school C agreed that the principal should have an important role and should support the staff members but added that the principal too needs the support of the staff members. This educator summed this up as follows:

> *The principal and the school management team cannot do everything without the support of the staff members. So while we, as the staff members need the support of the principal, the principal also needs our support for him to perform his duties effectively.*

Although almost all educators interviewed maintained that the most important role of the principal is to ensure that educators and other staff members have the necessary resources, an educator in school C contended that it is not always possible for the principal to provide these resources. The problem is that most schools in the area do not have enough funds. As a result these schools struggle to meet their needs. Although all educators interviewed in this study confirmed that their schools have a problem of shortage of funds, they insisted that principals should ensure that schools have enough resources. The educator in school B explained: "*I know there are no funds but without resources there is very little we can do*". However, an educator in school D was of the opinion that the problem of funds could be minimised if the principal did not only rely on school fees and/or the assistance from the Department of Education. According to this educator, principals also needed to look for assistance from the Non-Governmental Organisations if they want their schools to improve.

Principals maintained that before the whole-school evaluation was conducted in their school, they had to facilitate the process so that all staff members not only understand what was expected of them but also know what role each individual should play in whole-school evaluation. The principal of school B maintained that his role as a principal is to ensure that each staff member does his/her role as required. Therefore, the principal should make sure that everyone in the school not only knows what is expected of him/her but should also make sure that everyone performs his/her duties. Meanwhile, the principal of school A maintained that during the whole-school evaluation when the external evaluators were at the school, the principal has to ensure that each staff member co-operate with them. Likewise, the principal of school D maintained that one of the important roles that the principal should play in whole-school evaluation was to inspire educators to have a positive attitude towards whole-school evaluation and the external evaluators. The principal of school D explained this as follows: "*I explain to them that the aim of the whole-school evaluation was for the benefit of both the school and them (staff members)*". *So they need to co-operate with the supervisors*. The principal of school D adds that it is not always easy to deal with the attitudes of the individuals. As

a result one cannot claim to have successfully established a positive attitude towards the whole-school evaluation and the external evaluators.

According to the two supervisors, the role of the principal during the external evaluation is not extensive. But these supervisors agreed that the principal as the head of the school should help them find whatever information. For example, the principal should ensure that there is a temporary timetable that would accommodate the schedule of the external evaluators. Since the external evaluators check what is happening in and outside the classroom, for example, extra-mural activities, there is a need to change the timetable so that they can attend all these activities. One supervisor also mentioned that they conduct interviews with the principals and thus relied on the co-operation of the principal for successfully whole-school evaluation. The supervisor said: "*We (the supervisors) also have questionnaires that are directed to the principal. So the principal should fill in that questionnaire as honest as possible*".

Moreover, the supervisors maintained that they also rely on the co-operation of the principal with regard to school policies. They contended that most of the time they find that educators are not clear about some of the policies. As a result they rely on the assistance of the principal. A supervisor explained: "*There are certain books that we (supervisors) should ask from the principal, for example, logbook, time book, financial records et cetera*". This supervisor added that most of the disadvantaged schools do not have Financial Officers. Therefore, all information pertaining to finances should be obtained from the principal. As a result the principal becomes the supervisors' source of information. These supervisors also verify whatever they have found in the school with the principal before writing the report. "*So if the principal is not there it could be a problem*", one of the supervisors summed up.

Another supervisor also maintained that the role of the principal is also crucial before the whole-school evaluation is conducted because the principal has to inform educators, learners, members of the school governing body and parents and community members, including community leaders about the visit by the supervisors. According to these supervisors, it is very important that these individuals should know that the supervisors are coming because they also conduct interviews with certain educators, learners and parents/community members, including the community leader/s.

Discussion

All participants maintained that the principal has an important role to play not only in whole-school evaluation but also in supporting the staff members so that they can understand and implement changes. Therefore, principals as key individuals in facilitating improvement in their schools should always avail themselves to provide support when it is needed the most.

However, Sharpley (2004:57) is of the opinion that since school principals have been trained as educators, they may find it difficult to cope with new managerial responsibilities (cf 5.5.3). This does not, however, imply that principals have to abdicate their responsibilities.

It is crucial that all stakeholders should not only know their roles in whole-school evaluation but should also know those of others, especially those of the principal. According to Blandford (2000:5), stakeholders need to be aware of the internal and external parameters within which they work; confusion can lead to frustration and conflict.

5.6.7 The role of educators in whole-school evaluation

Educators have a very important role to play in successful whole-school evaluation. It is also crucial that educators should not only understand what role/s they should perform but that they also know how to perform their respective roles. Without their full participation in the whole-school evaluation, it would be difficult for whole-school evaluation to be conducted effectively.

But all educators interviewed in this study appeared to be uncertain about the role/s that they should play in whole-school evaluation. They all maintained that they performed no significant role/s during the whole-school evaluation in their schools. An educator in school C explained:

> *We (educators) did nothing significant during the external evaluation, other than ensuring that everything was in order. For example, ensuring that learners were in class all the time. But I would say during the internal evaluation we (educators) somehow helped each other to ensure that our work was in order.*

Almost all educators maintained that they were not actively involved in whole-school evaluation, before, during and after the whole-school evaluation. These educators maintained that the only thing that they did was to ensure that they updated their work. For example, they had to ensure that their lesson preparations were in order; their files and attendance registers were updated. But this, according to the educators, cannot be regarded as playing a role as these are their daily activities. "*We (educators) did not do much other than preparing ourselves for the visitors (external evaluators)*", an educator in school A said. An educator in school C maintained that even though they did not play a significant role, the fact that external evaluators interviewed some of them implies that they had a role in whole-school evaluation. This educator explained: "*Although most of us did not play a significant role, supervisors interviewed two educators. I think those two educators were representing us*".

Another educator in school A also concurred that educators somehow played an important role in whole-school evaluation as the external evaluators interviewed them. This educator maintained that she was part of the educators that were interviewed by the external evaluators. According to this educator, they asked her about everything taking place in the school: the conduct of the learners, the relationships among the staff members, the relationship between the principal and the staff members, between the principal and the learners and between the school and the community. This educator, moreover, maintains that they even asked about the members of the governing body, as well as about the surroundings. The educator summed this up as follows: "*I would say they (supervisors) wanted to find out how is the school functioning*". An educator in school C confirmed this and adds that the external evaluators also asked about the atmosphere in the school after they (staff members) learnt that they were to visit the school. According to this educator, the external evaluators wanted to determine if staff members in the school were apprehensive about their arrival and to determine the general feeling of the staff members about their presence in the school. This educator explained his assessment of the external evaluators as follows: "*I noticed that they (external evaluators) were not free that they did not know how we are going to treat them. They even told me that in other schools they were not welcomed and sometimes even chased away*".

Discussion

For educators to be able to perform their role in whole-school evaluation effectively, such role/s should be clearly explained. Each educator should understand what role to play, how and when.

However, this study reveals that educators are not certain as to what role they should play in whole-school evaluation. This should not be the case as educators are really the implementers of policies. Burton and Murugan (2004:62) regard an educator as a very important role-player in that he/she can either impact negatively or contribute greatly to the improvement of educational practices in schools. Therefore, educators need to be empowered so that they can perform their roles maximally.

5.6.8 The role of parents in whole-school evaluation

Parents, like all other role-players have an important role to play in whole-school evaluation in order for the school to benefit. But parents can only play a significant role if they understand and know what is expected of them.

All participants in this study agree that parents have a role in whole-school evaluation because for the school to function effectively all stakeholders need to be actively involved. However, most participants, particularly principals maintained that, in most cases, parents do not want to play their role in the education of their children. These principals contended that most parents, particularly in the disadvantaged schools tend to shift their responsibilities to the school. The principal of school A asserted: "*I think some parents feel inferior as a result they do not want to participate in what is taking place at school*". This principal made an example of the school governing bodies in disadvantaged schools. According to this principal, in most schools school governing bodies do not finish their term of office. The principal added that not only the school governing bodies are inactive, but also parents in general are reluctant to co-operate with the schools.

The principal of school D was of the opinion that the most important role that parents should play is to provide support to the school. This principal asserted that it is very difficult for the school to work without the support of the parents as well as the community at large. "*It is difficult for the learners to neglect their work if parents are working closely with the educators*", the principal of school C confirmed.

Meanwhile, the principal of school B felt that parents have a very crucial role in whole-school evaluation because whole-school evaluation is about everything associated with the school. For example, human resources and school physical infrastructures need the involvement of the parents. According to the participants, if parents are actively involved in the school's activities, the work of

the educators is much easier. Principals and educators maintained that there are a number of ways in which parents can be involved in the school. "*For example, our school (school B) had a lot of graffiti and parents decided to paint all classes*", said the principal of school B. An educator in school B maintained that the fact that external evaluators also interviewed parents during their visit confirmed that parents have a crucial role to play not only in whole-school evaluation but also in education in general.

Likewise, both supervisors interviewed in this study contended that part of their activities during their visits is to interview parents in order to establish how much parents are involved in the education of their children. According to these supervisors, parents should take an active part in the education system not only through the school governing bodies but also by ensuring that their children do go to school, do their work and also co-operate with the educators. One supervisor explained: "*Parents should not shift everything to the school governing bodies but they should also work with the school closely*". The principal of school D supported this and maintained that parents should always monitor their children's work. At times learners fail to do their homework and claim that they were busy with chores at home until very late and could not attend to their schoolwork. This principal was of the opinion that if the school and home work closely together, this can be prevented.

Discussion

The role that parents play or should play in supporting the school and their children to learn is very crucial. But all principals and educators who participated in this study complained about the lack of parent involvement in their schools. This can be attributed to, among others, the fact that many parents, particularly in the disadvantaged schools, are not well educated. As a result they feel inferior and become reluctant to participate in school activities.

Rault-Smith (2004:48) is of the opinion that to obtain parental support, a school has to overcome the fear of school experienced by many parents as a result of the harsh schooling they underwent during their schooling period. Problems are more easily resolved by parents and educators together than either alone (Everard & Morris, 1996:207). But this can only happen if both parties (parents & educators) know their roles and responsibilities.

5.6.9 The role of the District Office in whole-school evaluation

The District Office has an important role to play so that whole-school evaluation can yield the desired results. Should the District Office fail to play its part, the implementation of whole-school evaluation, particularly in the disadvantaged schools can become a futile exercise.

However, all school principals and educators interviewed in this study maintained that the District Office does not support them at all. They maintained that nothing happened after whole-school evaluation had been conducted. In fact, all principals and educators who participated in this study maintained that after obtaining a report with recommendations from the supervisors, nothing happened. The schools get no follow-up from the Department of Education. However, both principals and educators understood that schools should work together with their District Offices in addressing the recommendations that are made by the supervisors. An educator in school B explained:

> *The Department (the Department of Education) does not support us. The fact that nothing happened after the whole-school evaluation shows that this (visit by supervisors) was an event not a process. Our understanding was that after whole-school evaluation was conducted the Department would assist the school to ensure that the recommendations of the external evaluators are implemented. But after the supervisors we (the school) never had anything from the District Office.*

Another educator in school B added:

> *Yes. I agree. We are not getting any help from the Department. For example, when they (external evaluators) came here boys' toilets were not functioning. They were shocked but up to now the Department has not addressed that problem. Well, the principal has tried to address this problem but the problem is that the school does not have funds. As a result some of the toilets are still not working because we (the school) could not fix all of them (toilets). As a result we are working under difficult conditions. I mean conditions that are not conducive for effective teaching and learning.*

The principal of school C confirmed that after whole-school evaluation was conducted the schools were not given any help by the District Office. But this principal also maintained that the other problem is created by the fact that schools communicate with the District Office through the Circuit Office. As a result, in most cases schools do not know what is happening between the District Office and the Circuit Office. Likewise, the principal of school D maintained that the support that schools were promised before whole-school evaluation was conducted was not forthcoming. This confirms what an educator in school C asserted that the Department (the Department of Education) is too slow to support schools. This educator explained:

> *The issue of the Department is just out. The Department officials are good at criticising us (schools) but when you ask for assistance from them you can hardly get it. By this I am trying to tell you that the Department is providing no support at all.*

According to one superintendent who was interviewed in this study, the District Office is supposed to analyse the reports received from the external evaluators about or for each school. This official maintained that the District Office should identify common areas for improvement and provide assistance to schools. But this does not happen. This official said: "*Honestly, the District Office is not addressing the problems that have been identified by schools and/or supervisors*". But this official maintained that the Circuit Office in KwaMashu tries to assist KwaMashu schools where possible. According to this official, schools are advised not to wait for the District Office but also solicit outside help. The other superintendent was also doubtful if the District Office assisted schools after getting the reports with the recommendations. He explained:

> *After whole-school evaluation has been done the supervisors draw-up a report with their own recommendations. And they submit one report to the school, another to the District Office. Then the District Office should draw-up a plan of how they are going to address the recommendations made by the supervisors. But I doubt if this really happens. But my understanding is that after a few years they (supervisors) would come back to check if their recommendations have been addressed or not.*

Both external evaluators (supervisors) interviewed in this study confirmed that schools complain that they get no support from District Offices. These supervisors maintained that most, if not all, schools visited complained that their District Offices do not support them. One supervisor, however, indicated that supervisors do not have enough information regarding what actually happens after they have submitted their reports/recommendations to the District Offices. This official maintains that this information could be obtained from the Quality Management System Section. According to this supervisor, the Quality Management System Section visits the District Offices to check the school improvement plans for various schools as well as the district improvement plans. This supervisor was of the opinion that the people from the Quality Management System Section have enough information regarding the support that District Offices offers to schools. But as far as the supervisor knew District Offices have done very little in terms of assisting the schools to improve.

According to the other supervisor, the role of the district in whole-school evaluation is a big problem. This supervisor maintains that after supervisors have conducted the whole-school evaluation, they make recommendations and submit them to the District Office and to the school. So the District Office ought to attend to the areas that have been identified by the external evaluators as areas that need development. For example, if supervisors recommend that certain educators need certain skills, the Skills Section should send people to schools to develop educators on those skills. "*But this is not happening*", the supervisor said. Another supervisor maintains that after evaluation supervisors make recommendations, identifying areas that need attention, the schools should compile school improvement plans to be submitted to the District Offices. Thus, District Offices should collect school improvement plans from various schools and draw-up their district improvement plans based on the information submitted by the schools. From the district improvement plans the District Offices have to give support to needy schools.

Discussion

The District Office has a very important role to play in order for the initiatives of the Department of Education, as well as those of the government to succeed. It is important for the District Office which is close to the educators who implement the initiatives to interact with them regularly to ensure that they understand the initiatives and how to implement them effectively.

The District Office, therefore, should provide schools with the necessary resources to implement the new policies. However, according to all participants in this study, District Offices do not provide support to the schools before and after whole-school evaluation. District Offices are expected to, *inter alia*, induct the school principals and communities to whole-school evaluation processes (Department of Education, 2001b:9). Support to schools during the times of change is crucial to prevent schools from feeling neglected and to motivate educators.

Without the support of the District Offices schools find it difficult to implement the recommendations of the external evaluators/supervisors. As a result the whole exercise of whole-school evaluation becomes futile. The District Office should conduct an organisational evaluation and skills audit personnel; identify weaknesses and priorities needs and contract service providers to provide training and support in areas of need (England, 2004:20).

5.7 THE LINK BETWEEN WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM

Both whole-school evaluation and developmental appraisal system are parts of evaluation systems that aim at ensuring quality teaching and learning in the school. Therefore, all stakeholders should understand how these two approaches would benefit them and know the link between them (whole-school evaluation and developmental appraisal system). Such understanding is essential to ensure that all stakeholders perform their roles effectively in both whole-school evaluation and developmental appraisal system.

Participants in this study have different perceptions of the link between whole-school evaluation and developmental appraisal. But all participants agreed that both evaluation approaches aim at improving quality in the school. They maintained that while whole-school evaluation looks at what is happening in the school as a whole, developmental appraisal system is only concerned with the educator. An educator in school C felt that the developmental appraisal system helps to identify the strengths and weaknesses of a particular educator to assist that educator develop. Meanwhile, whole-school evaluation looks at both the work of the educators and other staff members in the school as well as the school as a whole. Whole-school evaluation is concerned about how the school as a whole functions and which areas need to be improved. An educator in school B explained:

> *Developmental appraisal system looks at what the educator does inside and outside the classroom but whole-school evaluation looks at everything in the school. These people (external evaluators) even evaluate school buildings*; *they interview some educators, learners and even parents.*

An educator in school C concurred with this and maintained that both whole-school evaluation and developmental appraisal have one purpose which is improvement of the school. According to this educator, while developmental appraisal system aims at improving the work of the educators, whole-school evaluation aims at improving the work of both the educators and the school as a whole. Likewise, the principal of school A maintained that much as developmental appraisal system was done by the people within the school and whole-school evaluation was done firstly by the people within the school (internal evaluation/school self-evaluation) and by external evaluators, both (whole-school evaluation and developmental appraisal system) have the same expectations. "*Both aim at improving and developing educators as well as the school*", the principal of school A said. As a result both look at the shortcomings of the educators and the whole school to make improvement where necessary. The principal of school B maintained that the link between whole-school evaluation and developmental appraisal is that both aim at improving teaching and learning as well as the environment within the school in general. The principal of school D explained as follows: "*I look at these two things (whole-school evaluation and developmental appraisal system) just as one thing. Both aim at the improvement of the school*".

The two superintendents agreed that whole-school evaluation and developmental appraisal system are interrelated. They maintained that an educator cannot perform his/her duties well in an abnormal situation. Therefore, the developmental appraisal system should ensure that educators are developed and whole-school evaluation should be conducted to determine if the environment is conducive for educators to work effectively. These officials argued that even if an educator can be developed certain factors within the school can hinder his/her performance. Therefore, these factors should be addressed in order to create an enabling environment for proper teaching and learning to take place. Thus, whole-school evaluation looks at the factors or aspects at the school that can have an impact on the performance of the school and/or the educator. One of the two officials maintained that there is a need for the development of the educator because this can lead to the effectiveness of the whole institution (school). This official expressed his opinion as follows:

If the institution as a whole is not conducive to the development of the educator there can be no effective teaching and learning. Therefore, whole-school evaluation should be conducted in order to see what areas within the school need improvement. At the same time developmental appraisal system should also be conducted in order to establish the kind of assistance that educators need. So the two (developmental appraisal system and whole-school evaluation) are related and that is why it is said that they are integrated.

Discussion

According to Oliphant and Tyatya (2004:34), whole-school evaluation and developmental appraisal systems were reconciled after much strife between the National Department of Education and the Educators' Unions. Both systems are necessary for the benefit of the learner.

The school cannot improve if the educators and other staff members are not being developed. Similarly, even if educators and other staff members are skilled, they cannot make any significance difference in the school if the conditions are unfavourable for them to do their work. Thus, both systems should be run concurrently as they link. As Oliphant and Tyatya (2004:35) put it, the two systems are clearly not in competition with one another. The foci are different and each has a different and complementary role to play.

5.7.1 The purpose of integrated quality management system (IQMS)

Monare (2006:3) regards IQMS as an internal peer review mechanism which is used to evaluate the work of the educators in the school. IQMS relates to whole-school evaluation and the developmental appraisal system as the two approaches (whole-school evaluation) are incorporated in it.

All participants in this study regard IQMS as a system that integrates the developmental appraisal system, whole-school evaluation and performance measurement with the aim of quality teaching and learning in the school. But the four principals and all educators interviewed in this study have mixed feelings about IQMS. For example, the principal of school A contended that they are not opposed to the system per se but they oppose the manner in which the system is being applied.

According to this principal, IQMS creates animosity among the staff members because some members of the staff use it to victimise other staff members. An educator in school B confirmed this. This educator maintained that an educator would either inflate the scores for their friends or reduce scores for those whom they dislike. Another educator in school B expressed her opinion as follows:

> *If your panel does not like you they just give you low marks. The problem is that in some instances you end-up choosing a person that does not like you but you have to choose him/her because of the subject that you teach. Really, this thing (IQMS) creates more problems for us (educators).*

All participants maintained that because there is money involved, the system (IQMS) is not being implemented faithfully and correctly. The principal of school C expresses his concern as follows:

> *I would say it (integrated quality management system) is the right thing if it could be applied correctly and fairly. But the problem is that there is money involved and in most cases when there is money involved people tend to be dishonest in order to get money. As a result the purpose of IQMS has shifted to focus on monetary gain not on the development of the educator and the school. The problem is that people (educators) want to get money out of the whole thing. The purpose is not about that; the purpose is about the development of the educators and schools, not financial gains.*

The principal of school C adds: "*But as far as I am concerned it (IQMS) is a right system which can help educators to develop if it can be correctly implemented*".

An educator in school D said: "*I think the developmental appraisal system and whole-school evaluation are integrated by the integrated quality management system*".

One of the two supervisors confirmed that educators often do not do justice when giving themselves scores. This supervisor indicated that educators had given themselves scores which were too high. As the supervisor puts it, "*Really, this defeats the purpose of the IQMS (integrated quality management system)"*. The principal of school B regarded IQMS as the system that aims at

improving what needs to be improved in the school. According to this principal, the only difference between the integrated quality management system and other systems is that it is accompanied by some incentives. "*But the purpose is just the same, that is, to identify areas that need improvement*", said the principal of school B.

Discussion

Participants regard IQMS as an approach that is aimed at ensuring that all quality management systems are being implemented. But certain individuals question the manner in which this approach is being implemented. For example, the Minister of Education, Naledi Pandor, maintains that while learners are failing at schools, educators' valuation sheets reflect high performance scores through an unmonitored peer review system (Monare, 2006:3).

Because there are so many programmes that aim at ensuring quality education in South African schools, these programmes should be aligned. According to the Education Labour Relation Council (2003:4), one of the main purposes of the alignment process is to enable the different Quality Management System programmes to inform and strengthen one another. However, four years after the Department of Education and unions reached agreement on evaluating educators' classroom performance, Minister Pandor has admitted that no one is checking whether educators are doing their job properly (Monare, 2006:3).

5.8 THE IMPLEMENTATION OF WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION IN KWAMASHU SCHOOLS

Whole-school evaluation is being implemented or conducted in South African schools, including schools in KwaMashu area. But the pace of implementation in the Province of KwaZulu-Natal in general and KwaMashu area in particular is slow. The two supervisors in this study attributed this to a shortage of supervisors in KwaZulu-Natal. The National Department of Education selects schools to be evaluated and submits a large number of schools to the Provincial Department of Education. Since the number of supervisors in the Province is limited, they cannot visit all the schools selected. Moreover, supervisors spend between three to five days on a visit depending on the size of the school. As a result external evaluators have not yet evaluated most schools in KwaZulu-Natal, including schools in KwaMashu area.

The understanding of whole-school evaluation by the principals and educators has a bearing on how it is being implemented at different schools. For example, all principals and most of the educators in this study maintained that they have undergone no training on whole-school evaluation. This has a negative impact on their preparation for the whole-school evaluation (both internal and external evaluations); during the external evaluation as well as after external evaluation has been conducted. For whole-school evaluation to be conducted effectively, the implementers should have a clear understanding of whole-school evaluation and its implications.

Principals and educators interviewed in this study have different perceptions and experiences as far as the manner in which whole-school evaluation was conducted in their different schools. For example, educators in school B maintained that they were not given enough time to prepare themselves. According to these educators, there was not enough time for them to conduct an internal evaluation (school self-evaluation). As a result external evaluators found most of the staff members at school B inadequately prepared.

Meanwhile, educators in school C maintained that school self-evaluation helped them to prepare for external evaluation. According to these educators, during the school self-evaluation they evaluated themselves in order to identify their strengths and weaknesses. After they had identified their weaknesses, they developed themselves. One of the educators interviewed in school C has the following to say about the school self-evaluation: "*I think self-evaluation helped us because by the time the external evaluators came we (educators) had corrected a number of things in our school*". According to the educators in school D, the team leader of the external evaluators first visited the school and had discussions with the principal. The principal subsequently had meetings with the staff members in order to explain to them what the supervisors would require during their visit. Meanwhile, educators in school B maintained that even though they had meetings prior to the external evaluation, they were unsure of what would be required by the external evaluators since whole-school evaluation is an entirely new venture.

All educators interviewed in this study maintained that supervisors observed and checked everything in their schools. For example, supervisors observed educators teaching, they observed learners playing during the break time and they interviewed learners, educators and even hawkers in schools. But they did not observe all educators teaching. They just picked out a few educators. But

an educator who was observed in school C appreciated the manner in which the external evaluators conducted them. This educator expresses his praise as follows:

> *I was very pleased with the way the official (supervisor) that observed me in the classroom. After the lesson the supervisor sat down with me and recommended how I should have approached the lesson. I regarded that as a developmental approach because did not criticise me but he advised me what I should do in the future.*

Likewise, all principals in this study contended that external evaluators check almost everything in the school. For example, they went to the classes to observe educators teaching and their communication with the learners. Principals also confirmed that the external evaluators interviewed some educators, learners, non-teaching staff members, parents as well as members of the school governing bodies. The principal of school A explained: "*These people (external evaluators) wanted to know what is happening in the school and they also wanted to find out about the relationships between all stakeholders*".

An educator in school D confirmed that external evaluators checked everything in the school. Another educator in school D added: "*They (supervisors) even checked the drains, cleanliness, and late-coming, almost everything in the school*". Likewise, the principal of school D said that supervisors divided themselves according to their fields of specialisations. According to this principal, some supervisors were responsible for teaching and learning; others dealt with administrative matters. For example, the latter concentrated on all school records, policies and financial statements. "*They (supervisors) even checked the school results for the five past years*", the principal of school D explained.

Supervisors maintained that they conduct external evaluation in order to validate the information found by the schools when they conducted the internal evaluation (school self-evaluation). However, often the schools' self-evaluation did not tally with the supervisors' findings. For example, one supervisor said that educators often give themselves high scores. This supervisor explained: "*They (educators) say they can perform well and they do their work very well. In fact, we always find that everything is almost perfect. But when we check we normally find the opposite*".

Both supervisors alleged that educators may give themselves high scores because remuneration is involved. Thus, no educator wants to underscore him or herself. According to these supervisors, the problem with over-scoring is that the educator implies that he/she does not need help. But if the educator acknowledges that he/she has a problem in a particular area, the Department of Education can intervene with an intention of helping that particular educator. As one of the supervisors explained: "*If the educator says he/she has a problem with planning he/she should be helped. And that can help him/her to develop*". This supervisor, however, added that principals are also involved in persuading educators to over-score themselves. For example, the principal may fear that if he/she does not award high scores, educators may complain about his/her principalship.

Discussion

The manner in which whole-school evaluation is being conducted in schools is crucial because it determines its broader success in the South African context. For whole-school evaluation to be conducted effectively, supervisors should understand the uniqueness of schools. In South African schools disparities still exist and these disparities have a big impact on the implementation of the new initiatives (cf 1.2). As Sharpley (2004:58) puts it, while there is one education system (in South Africa), every school is different and is in a unique environment.

It is also important that all stakeholders should know beforehand what is expected of them when whole-school evaluation is being conducted. Each individual should understand and know his/her role to minimise confusion and uncertainties.

5.9 PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY SCHOOLS DURING THE WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION

Many schools in South Africa are situated in previously deprived communities which are still impoverished. Past disparities between the previously advantaged and disadvantaged schools still exist. These disparities have a positive and/or negative bearing on educational changes, including whole-school evaluation. As a result previously advantaged schools are still advantaged and most of the previously disadvantaged schools are still disadvantaged. Thus, the problems encountered by schools in the KwaMashu area may be similar to problems encountered by schools in other previously disadvantaged schools (Mazibuko, 2003:90). For whole-school evaluation as well as

other educational changes to be implemented successfully, all problems that may impede the implementation of these educational changes should be speedily addressed. But most schools, particularly the disadvantaged schools, lack funds to address these problems. For example, the principal of school A maintained that in their school the staff members have been unable to address most things identified by the supervisors as needing attention. "*The school cannot afford to do these things because there are no funds available*", the principal of school A said.

Principals and educators interviewed in this study maintained that financial constraints and other crucial issues make it difficult for their schools to address areas or issues identified by the supervisors as areas that need attention for the development of these schools. They identified the following areas as some of the critical ones. These are, however, some among many areas that are possible. These are not all inclusive and no doubt that others can also be identified (cf 3.2).

5.9.1 Lack of resources

Whole-school evaluation like all other educational changes and/or school activities can only be successfully conducted in a school where there are enough resources. But as in most previously disadvantaged schools, schools in KwaMashu area lack resources and this has a negative impact on the implementation of educational changes. Educators clearly need adequate resources to aid them and in their absence, learners struggle. Where schools have a library or book collection, an Internet connection or a teaching resources centre learners do better (Department of Education, 2005:5).

All participants in this study expressed their concern about the lack of resources in most schools in the area (KwaMashu). Principals and educators, in particular, indicated that the lack of resources made it difficult to prepare for and conduct whole-school evaluation when the schools are visited by the external evaluators. Moreover, a lack of resources makes it difficult to implement other educational changes. For example, an educator in school C maintains that the staff members in school C struggled to ensure that everything was in order before the arrival of the external evaluators. Another educator in school B contended that even during the external evaluation, the educators struggled because there were no enough teaching and learning materials in their school. All schools in this study shared the lack of resources. Principals and educators maintained that the lack of resources is an ongoing problem. An educator in school C complained about lack of resources: "*Really, it is difficult to teach with limited resources. Even when the external evaluators*

visited us we (educators) had to share the few resources that we have". Another educator in school C added: "*Remember, everyone wanted to impress the external evaluators. But it was difficult because there were a few resources to use in your lessons*".

Likewise, both supervisors confirmed that most schools in KwaMashu lack resources. This is a common phenomenon in most previously disadvantaged schools in KwaZulu-Natal. According to these officials, part of their work is to establish what resources schools have and to check how schools use the resources that are available. However, one supervisor asserted that most schools in the KwaMashu area are better off in terms of resources when compared to schools in the remote rural areas. For example, the official mentioned a school in a remote rural area. According to this supervisor, the school has 26 educators but half (13) of them are unqualified or underqualified. This stresses the poor quality of education in rural schools throughout South Africa. It is difficult for the principal to operate in the school where half of the educators are unqualified. As one of the supervisor put it: "*Really, in a case like this you cannot speak of developing educators because these people are not even supposed to be teaching in the first place*".

According to all principals and educators, resources are not only unavailable in their schools but are also not available in the community. This compounds the problem, as community structures are unable to supplement schools, learners and educators. As a result most disadvantaged schools in KwaMashu and other areas struggle to implement educational changes successfully because of limited resources.

Discussion

Whether schools can be able to achieve their goals depends on an ability to match their resources with those goals (Everard & Morris, 1996:203). Whole-school evaluation has tremendous potential to improve the quality of schools, but then it needs to be resourced more adequately (Potterton, 2004:71). Therefore, the issue of lack of resources raised by schools in this study needs to be addressed soon. Moloi (2002:xiv) concurs that some township schools still do not have enough resources. Most of these schools have to operate in environments that are regarded as disabling. But Sterling and Davidoff (2000:3) argue that many schools are managing to cope creatively despite a harsh context, particularly resource constraints. Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:127) maintain that it is

not only the responsibility of the government to provide the necessary resources for schools. But the private sector also needs to play a role.

5.9.2 Overcrowding

All four schools participated in this study raised concerns about overcrowding. Educators, in particular maintained that overcrowding affects teaching and learning negatively. According to the educators, the new system of teaching emphasises individual attention to the learners. But this is not always possible because their classes are overcrowded.

All educators interviewed maintained that during whole-school evaluation supervisors accused them of not following the new approach of teaching. According to these educators, this was generally the result of large classes. Educators also contend that because of overcrowding it is difficult for them to divide learners into groups. There is no floor space available for group teaching so they resort to the old way of teaching. An educator in school B said supervisors were irate that they still used the old method of teaching. This educator explained:

> *Supervisors complained that we are not using the new methods of teaching. They were really not happy about that. But they could see that our classes are too big. For example, in most classes learners were not divided into groups as required by the new style of teaching.*

An educator in school D also contended that the problem of large classes has a bearing on discipline and marking. It is very difficult to deal with or to discipline a large class and complete marking in time. This educator explained:

> *But at times it is not that we do not want to do our work or we do not want to submit our work in time. The problem is that we are teaching big classes. So we have a lot of work to do. Really, our classes are too big as a result we have a problem of marking.*

Meanwhile, the principal of school D maintained that the effects of large classes are aggravated if an educator is teaching the lower grades as well as the higher grades. In such cases, educators spend

most of the time doing the work of the higher class. For example, when an educator is teaching grade eight or nine as well as grade twelve that educator pays more attention to grade twelve's work, neglecting the other grades. According to this principal, educators concentrate on grade twelve because the school is judged by the grade twelve results and the Departmental officials focus on grade twelve work. This principal said: "*This is not a good thing to do*. *But the problem is that our classes are too big and educators have a lot of marking to do*".

Discussion

The concerns raised by schools who participated in this study with regard to overcrowding confirms what Van Wyk (1999b:83) maintains that few issues rouse stronger feelings among educators than class size, and few have more direct implications for school policy and practice. Educators believe that the quality of their teaching and their interactions with learners decline with an increase in the size of the class. Overcrowding, thus, makes it difficult for educators to pay individual attention to their learners (cf 3.5.3).

Crowded schools and large classes have long been a feature of the majority of South African schools (Lemmer, 1998:41). In most disadvantaged schools it is common that three learners share a two sitter-desk and classes are so overcrowded that one cannot move around the classroom. For effective teaching and learning to take place, the issue of overcrowding should be immediately addressed. According to Mhlongo (2006:3), over the past three years (2003 – 2005) learner-educator ratio in KwaZulu-Natal schools has dropped from 1:34.9 to 1:31. Although this sounds good, most classes in many disadvantaged schools are still overcrowded. Therefore, learner-educator ratios in disadvantaged schools need to be drastically reduced. But Van Wyk (1999b:83) is of the opinion that a decrease in class size will on the other hand increase per-learner costs by approximately 25% (cf 3.5.3). This, however, depends on how much is class size decreased.

5.9.3 Lack of support from the Department of Education

The support from the Department of Education to schools is very important, particularly during the times of change. However, all principals and educators interviewed in this study maintained that they get no support at all from the Department. Without the support of the Department of Education it is unlikely that changes being introduced in the country can be successful.

According to all principals and educators in this study, schools get no support from the Department (Department of Education) before, during and after whole-school evaluation. Almost all educators complained that they are expected to deliver but the Department is unable to ensure that they have all the necessary things in place. One educator in school A said: "*I am afraid, the Department does absolutely nothing. They do not help us*". Another educator in school A concurs and adds: "*So you end-up going out and look for the information because there is little that you can get from the Department*". According to the principals and educators, some areas identified by the supervisors as areas that need improvement would have been attended to if the Department was willing to address their concerns. The four principals and educators maintained that they always ask for help from the Department but nothing happens. The principal of school D expresses his desperation as follows: "*The Department (Circuit Office/District Office) always makes promises but nothing happens*".

However, the superintendents who participated in this study disagreed that the Department of Education, particularly the Circuit Office, does not support schools. These officials argue that the Circuit Office always support schools when necessary. However, both officials maintained that they did not see the District Office addressing the problems that have been identified by the schools and/or supervisors during the whole-school evaluation. As a result the Circuit Office intervenes where possible to ensure that schools get assistance. A superintendent explained:

> *We (the Circuit Office officials) do not wait for the District Office because we know that the District Office has its own problems. So what we do we just go to the school and ask them to try and address their problems. For example, we advise them to look for assistance from outside*.

However, another superintendent made a different statement regarding the support that the Circuit Office offers to the schools in terms of whole-school evaluation. According to this official, there was nothing that the Circuit Office can do if the District Office failed to support schools. This official said: "*Well, schools tell us that they do not get help from the District Office. But there is very little that we, as a Circuit Office can do*". The principal of school C confirmed that the Circuit Office has no role to play in whole-school evaluation. According to this principal, whole-school evaluation is structured in such a way that schools can only get support from the District Office. As a result the role of the Circuit Office is minimal as far as whole-school evaluation is concerned.

This principal explained: "*Really, I do not know how the Circuit Office can assist us (schools). It is the District Office that should support us but they are not giving us any support"*.

Both supervisors who participated in this study maintained that most of the schools that they had visited complained that they got no support from the District Offices. These supervisors contended that they find some schools, particularly the disadvantaged schools, in appalling conditions. A supervisor explained as follows: "*Wherever we go people (principals and educators) complain that they get no assistance from District Offices. Really, District Offices do not play their roles*". One supervisor was of the opinion that the Department (Circuit Offices/District Offices) should constantly work closely with the schools for the sake of whole-school evaluation, general effectiveness and school improvement.

Discussion

According to Naicker and Waddy (2002:15), there is a chain of responsibility from the National Ministry to individual schools. But schools in this study maintained that the Department of Education is not supportive. Without the support of the Department of Education, locally, provincially and/or nationally no initiatives can be successful. This study, however, reveals that schools in the study find the Department not supportive to the schools. Mda (1998:78) contends that there is a tendency to limit support services in education to support services to learners. This has a negative impact, particularly on the disadvantaged schools.

The assistance and continued support which schools require should come from Provincial, Regional and District education Departments. These Departments have a major task in helping schools adopt the new approach to management, in providing support and in mobilising other sources of support (Department of Education, 1996:31). According to England (2004:18), most Provincial Education Departments have limited capacity to support and develop schools. Therefore, they need to contract service providers in order to assist them.

5.10 THE RESULTS OF WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION IN KWAMASHU SCHOOLS

Like in all other evaluations, the results of the whole-school evaluation are very important because results determine what action should be taken after evaluation. The results of whole-school

evaluation (both internal and external evaluations) in schools in this study vary. Participants in this study, particularly principals and educators, maintained that these results are influenced by a number of factors: the availability of resources/funds, the attitude of staff members towards their work, the support from the Department of Education, and the influence of the community on what is happening in the school.

According to the supervisors interviewed in this study, the results of whole-school evaluation in KwaMashu schools where whole-school evaluation has been done were generally acceptable. These officials contended that considering the particular circumstances of each school that they had visited, the overall performance of all schools is acceptable. However, the supervisors also added that each school has its own strengths and weaknesses that are influenced by a number of factors within and outside the school. It is against this background that whole-school evaluation does not only take into account what is happening in the school but also takes into account of what is happening outside the school. As a result supervisors do not only interview the principal, educators and learners but they also interview parents, community members and even community leaders to ascertain what is happening in and around the school. According to these supervisors, understanding the circumstances that have an impact on the school leads to a better understanding of the functionality of the school and the challenges faced by the school. But these supervisors maintained that their focus is always based on the nine focus areas, namely basic functionality of the school; leadership, management and communication; governance and relationships; the quality of teaching and educator development; curriculum provision and resources; learner achievement; school safety, security and discipline; school infrastructure as well as parent and community involvement (cf 2.3.3.1 to 2.3.3.9).

In order to have a picture of the results of whole-school evaluation in KwaMashu schools in general and the schools in the study in particular, the results in respect of some of the above focus areas are reviewed.

5.10.1 Basic functionality of the school

The basic function of a school is to ensure that learners learn. Basic functionality of the school is one of the most important focus areas that supervisors check when they visit the school to conduct the external evaluation. This is done in order to determine if the school is fulfilling its mandate.

Basically, basic functionality of the school gives a broad picture of what is happening in a particular school.

Principals and educators in this study also confirmed that supervisors who visited their schools maintained that the overall performance of their schools was acceptable. But both principals and educators pointed out that there were certain things that supervisors were not happy about. For example, the principal of school B maintains that supervisors indicated that they (school B) did not have all the policies in place. According to this principal, supervisors also complained about the high rate of absenteeism as well as high rate of late coming in school B. Moreover, supervisors also pointed out that the school (school B) does not have policies to deal with late coming, truancy and absenteeism amongst learners and staff members. "*They complained that lessons that they observed were interrupted by learners who came late*", the principal explained. An educator in school B concurs and maintained that supervisors were not happy with certain things in their school. For example, they pointed out that some learners (boys) smoke dagga in the school premises and no disciplinary actions were taken against those learners. Another educator in school B also pointed out that the supervisors were not impressed by the behaviour of some learners in some classes. According to this educator, supervisors indicated that some learners showed no interest in learning. Looking at the information given by the principal and educators of school B regarding the basic functionality of the school, it becomes apparent that the supervisors were not quite impressed about what is happening in school B. For example, the principal maintained that supervisors raised a number of concerns regarding the functionality of the school. The educators who participated in this study confirmed this.

The principal of school D also maintained that supervisors indicated that although they have policies in place, the majority of these policies are not well articulated to all stakeholders within the school. Meanwhile, the principal of school A maintained that the supervisors were very impressed with their policies. According to this principal, supervisors indicated that their school (school A) has well-structured policies and clearly articulated procedures specific to absenteeism, lateness and truancy. This principal also pointed out that supervisors were also generally impressed by the discipline in the school. The principal maintained that supervisors praised the behaviour of their learners as well as their general enthusiasm about learning. The principal of school A explained: "*They (supervisors) were impressed about a number of things in our school. Well, there were areas that they said we (school A) needed to address. But, generally, they were impressed*".

An educator in school C also pointed out that in their school the supervisors were impressed with the relationship between the learners and educators both inside and outside the classroom. But another educator in school C was quick to point out that supervisors, nonetheless, complained that learners are not supervised during the break (recess) times. According to this educator, supervisors maintained that learners should be always supervised even during the break and/or lunch time.

Discussion

Many township schools show clear signs of a breakdown in structures and processes: malfunctioning administration, loss of authority among educators and principals, poor time management, disinterest, apathy, lack of motivation, poor communication and late coming, while learners can be seen roaming the township streets during the teaching hours (Moloi, 2002:xv). These things have a negative bearing on the functionality of any school and, therefore, need to be addressed.

Most schools in KwaMashu Township are no different from the schools referred to above. As principals and educators who participated in this study pointed out, supervisors that visited their schools indicated that they (supervisors) were not happy about certain things in these schools. For example, some schools did not have all the policies in place and the supervisors also complained about discipline in secondary schools. Policies, rules and norms can directly influence classroom activities by ensuring that there is adequate time in the school for teaching and learning and indirectly by symbolising to learners, educators and parents that academics are important (Donmoyer & Wagstaff, 1990:22).

5.10.2 Leadership, management and communication

The success of any institution depends on the leadership and managerial role played by those that are tasked to steer the institution. Therefore, schools like any other institution should be led and managed by visionary individuals. There should also be proper communication channels to avoid unnecessary misunderstandings.

According to the supervisors in this study, a key issue in the school is a clear shared, well-communicated vision and mission statement, policies and proper procedures. They also check if

leadership is taking place at all levels and if these structures are fully operational. One of the supervisors explained as follows:

> *We check if meetings of the School Management Team, Staff and School Governing Bodies do take place*. S*o we need minutes of these meetings as evidence. But I must add that whatever discussed must be communicated to the relevant stakeholders. So we also check if there are proper procedures for communicating with various stakeholders*.

Although the four principals in this study maintained that there were areas that supervisors were not satisfied with; supervisors commended them on others. For example, the principal of school C maintained that supervisors were impressed that their management structure is clear and participative. This principal also indicated that they always try to ensure that every staff member is involved in decision-making processes. As this principal put it: "*This minimises problems because everyone is involved from the beginning*". Meanwhile, the principal of school A maintained that the supervisors were impressed by both their internal and external communication systems. This principal explained: "*This was a plus for our school (school A) and everyone was happy about this*". But the principal of school A was quick to add that supervisors also indicated that school A needs to have short, medium and long term objectives in their school development plan. Moreover, the external evaluators indicated that school A should translate the vision and mission statement of the school into the vernacular used by the learner community. "*Really, we never thought that there was a need to do that (translating the vision and mission statement into the language of the learner community)*", the principal of school A said.

The principal of school B maintained that supervisors were not impressed that the school had no development plan in place. But the principal was quick to indicate that they have, however, drawn-up the development plan. While all principals maintained that supervisors found that they (all four schools) have policies, the principal of school B indicated that they (supervisors) were not happy that some of the policies are not being implemented. The supervisors also confirmed that in most schools policies are not implemented despite the fact that policies are well drawn-up. One of the supervisors maintained that to determine whether policies are implemented, they conducted interviews with stakeholders. The supervisors conducted interviews with learners to check if they

know anything about the policies. For example, they conducted interviews with learners to check if they know about their code of conduct. This supervisor explained as follows:

> *So we check if they (learners) know about the code of conduct. And it they do not know anything about it, obviously, it means it is not being implemented. We also conduct interviews with educators, for example, to check if they know anything about the language policy. We also conduct interviews with heads of departments. Sometimes we find that even the heads of departments know nothing about the admission policy. And we also conduct interviews with parents. In most cases, we discover that parents were not even involved in drawing-up these policies. That is how we come to the conclusion that although they (policies) are there, they are, however, not being implemented.*

But one educator in school B maintained that one of the reasons that most policies are not being implemented is too many changes as a result educators do not understand most of these new changes. The principal of school D also confirmed that the Department of Education makes things difficult for the schools by making so many changes too quickly. According to this principal, these changes are confusing as a result most schools do not implementing them. This principal put this as follows: "*Really, we (schools) do not know where we stand. At times the Department tells us to do something and a few days down the line we are told that that thing is no longer working and something new has come out*".

In fact, all participants in this study echoed these sentiments. All participants maintained that they are not sure of their future because the Department of Education changes all the times. This, definitely, has a negative impact on the performance of these individuals. No one can be motivated to work effectively if he/she is not sure of his/her future.

Discussion

At the heart of school life are leadership, management and governance. These aspects of school life ensure that all other aspects are held together and developed (Davidoff & Lazarus, 2002:36). There should, therefore, a clear direction from the principal, the school management team and the school governing body as to where the school should be going.

The school should not only have a shared vision, well stated goals and objectives but these should also be clearly communicated to all stakeholders. This can be done through, among the other things, regular meetings/briefings, internal workshops and circulars. As Frase and Melton (1992:17) put it, great managers and leaders have always spent more time in the actual worksite or with their troops than in their office.

5.10.3 The quality of teaching and educator development

The quality of teaching is always determined by the quality of educators that the school has. It is, therefore, most important that the principal should always take educator development as one of the critical roles.

According to the supervisors, the quality of teaching in KwaMashu schools is acceptable. This confirmed what the principal of school A indicated that supervisors were impressed by the quality of work in their school A. These supervisors also indicated that the majority of educators in schools who they have visited in KwaMashu are well qualified. As a result educators are able to facilitate effective teaching and learning. However, one of the supervisors was concerned about the role of the heads of departments in most disadvantaged schools. According to this supervisor, there is a lack of support from the heads of departments in most schools not only in KwaMashu, generally in KwaZulu-Natal. "*This has an impact on the manner in which educators perform their duties*", one of the supervisors said. Principals, educators and the two superintendents in this study confirmed that the majority of educators in KwaMashu Circuit are well qualified. According to the two superintendents, most educators in KwaMashu Circuit are well qualified and the circuit and schools do not employ the services of unqualified educators. One superintendent was of the opinion that one of the reasons that KwaMashu has no shortage of well-qualified educators is that KwaMashu is in an urban area and all people want to be close to Durban. Moreover, there are many institutions of higher education where these educators can improve their qualifications. The two officials (superintendents) also indicated that the KwaMashu Circuit Office organises workshops for both principals and educators to ensure that they can perform their duties effectively and efficiently. One of the superintendents explained:

> *Really, our educators are well equipped to provide quality teaching but the problem is that most schools in the area do not have the necessary resources. As a*

> *result it is not always possible for these educators to provide quality education. But I am sure if our schools can have all the necessary tools, the quality of teaching in KwaMashu can improve tremendously, given the quality of educators that we have in the Circuit. But I am still happy with their performance if one considers the circumstances under which these educators work.*

All schools in this study indicated that they have started with educator development programmes to support educators to improve their teaching skills. According to the principal of school C, these programmes have helped to improve the attitude of educators towards their work. Likewise, the principal of school D agreed that since they have started these development programmes, there has been a great improvement in the manner in which educators approach their work. This principal explained: "*Since we started these programmes, most of the educators are committed to their work*". An educator in school A confirmed that workshops were beneficial to them. According to this educator, the workshops both organised by the school and the Department of Education help them in developing self-confidence when approaching their schoolwork. But another educator in school D maintained that workshops, particularly those that are organised by the Department of Education are not always fruitful as incompetent people sometimes facilitate these workshops.

An educator in school B also indicated that the supervisors noted that in their school, there is a lack of educator and learner support material. As a result most learners do not show interest in their work and do not participate actively during teaching and learning. But one of the supervisors maintained that lack of teaching and learning materials is a common problem to all previously disadvantaged schools that they have visited. This supervisor explained: "*This has a negative impact on teaching and learning*". However, the supervisor pointed out that educators use the few teaching and learning resources that the school has effectively to promote teaching and learning in the classrooms.

Discussion

If the quality of teaching and learning and ultimately, the culture of teaching and learning are to be improved, the development of educators is necessary as part of in-service training. Although ongoing professional development is the primary responsibility of the educator himself/herself, the

principal remains an important partner and participant in implementing staff development programmes (Kruger, 2003a:250).

Without ongoing programmes and processes to encourage and support staff development, schools become out of tough with educational trends and educators lose the sense of renewal and inspiration which is such an essential part of a meaningful education (Davidoff & Lazarus, 2002:33). If staff development programmes are properly done, they can lead to effective quality teaching and learning.

Educator or staff development programmes need to be developed around the particular needs of the individual staff and school situation and should correspond with the vision (Davidoff & Lazarus, 2002:33). This can enable educators to build a positive, friendly and supportive relationship with their learners (Lemmer, 1998:39).

5.10.4 Curriculum provision and resources

All schools in South Africa are expected to provide learners with a well-balanced curriculum which has all the elements of the national curriculum requirements. Curriculum provision should take both the national and local needs into account.

According to the four principals interviewed in this study, supervisors that visited their schools for whole-school evaluation contend that the curriculum that these schools provide to their learners are in line with the national and local polices and procedures. The principal of school A has the following to say: "*They (the supervisors) said our school curriculum is well-structured and promotes effective teaching and learning*". Moreover, the principal of school B maintained that although the supervisors were impressed by the school curriculum, the supervisors pointed out that the planning of the curriculum is neither uniform nor consistent in all subjects/learning areas.

All principals pointed out that supervisors were impressed with participation in extra-curricular activities. According to these principals, supervisors maintained that participating in extra-curricular activities enhances the curriculum. Moreover, principals of schools A and D said that they had won some certificates in these events. For example, school A has won many trophies for cultural activities; school D has won trophies for soccer and athletics. The principal of school A

also pointed out that the supervisors were also impressed that they enrich the school curriculum by providing computer literacy courses to the learners, educators and parents and community members. Likewise, the principal of school C maintained that supervisors were impressed that some forms of extra-curricula activities are incorporated within the school curriculum, for example, soccer and netball. This principal maintained that the acknowledgement of their involvement in extra-curricula activities by the supervisors motivated staff members to participate in these activities. This principal explained this as follows:

> *Although some staff members did not want to involve themselves in extra-curricula activities, after we were complemented by the supervisors the number of people participating in extra-curricula activities increased*". *As you (the researcher) can see, these are some of the trophies that our school has won and we are really proud of our learners. But I think I must add that you cannot have dedicated learners without a dedicated staff. These trophies are a proof that we have a dedicated staff.*

But an educator in school B raised his concern of the shortage of resources. According to this educator, much as educators are willing to provide quality teaching and learning without enough resources they will not succeed. Likewise, supervisors were concerned that schools in KwaMashu have insufficient resources, like teaching and learning support materials to promote teaching and learning in the classroom. However, these supervisors pointed out that lack of teaching and learning support materials is a common problem experienced by most disadvantaged schools in KwaZulu-Natal. "*I am sure most disadvantaged schools in all Provinces experience this problem* (*lack of teaching and learning support materials*)", one supervisor said.

The supervisors also raised concerns about assessment in most disadvantaged schools. According to these supervisors, assessments of learners are not properly done in most schools. These supervisors maintained that most educators, particularly in disadvantaged schools, are still not familiar with the assessment requirements. As a result, in most cases, they find assessment misaligned with curriculum changes. A supervisor said: "*Most schools* (*disadvantaged schools*) *struggle with assessment. We sometimes find assessment in some schools in a mess*".

Discussion

The primary task of the school is to offer instruction. The school's educational programme, consisting of both the curricular and extra-curricular activities, may be regarded as the school's broad curriculum. The function of the broad curriculum is to structure different subjects, learning areas and activities in a school in such a way as to accomplish educative teaching (Kruger, 2003a:249). But this function can be hardly realised if the school does not have enough resources. For any activity to be effectively implemented in the school there should be enough resources and these resources should be also appropriate for that activity.

It is also important that educators should be given proper training on how to assess the learners. Assessment forms an integral part of teaching and learning activities. Therefore, educators should know what, when and how to assess. As Malan in Mazibuko (2003:38) puts it, educators have a central role to play in assessment, as they have to communicate information to the learners, parents, principals and the departmental officials.

5.10.5 Learner achievement

The success of teaching and learning determines the level of learner achievement. Learner achievement should not only be viewed as classroom performance but also as holistic development of learners through extra-curricula activities and school support structures, such as counseling (Westraad, 2004:3). It is against this background that whole-school evaluation also focuses on the learner achievement. This helps to ascertain whether teaching and learning have desired effects or not.

Generally, the two supervisors interviewed in this study maintained that they were satisfied with the level of learner achievement in KwaMashu schools. The principal of school A confirmed that in his school supervisors found that learners speak confidently in both languages of teaching and learning (IsiZulu and English). Likewise, the principal of school C maintained that supervisors were impressed that a significant number of the learners can speak and communicate in English. Moreover, supervisors were impressed that the majority of the learners are progressing according to their age. The principal commented: "*This was an indication that educators are doing their work*". However, the principal was quick to point out that supervisors found performance of the majority of

the learners in mathematics below standard. However, School C was well respected not only for its quality teaching and learning but also for its performance in extra-curricular activities.

Meanwhile, principals of schools B and D (both secondary schools) maintained that supervisors were impressed by their grade twelve results. Both principals maintained that their schools have obtained certificates of excellence in grade twelve more than once. All four principals as well as educators observed by supervisors maintained that the latter had pointed out the lack of remedial programmes to assist learners having difficulties in their learning. Moreover, an educator in school B felt that it is now easier to pass grades twelve than previously. This educator maintained that although the results of grade twelve in school B have improved consistently over the past few years, school leavers do not cope at tertiary level. Another educator in school B confirmed that generally, the standard of matric has been lowered. One educator in school B commented:

> *Most of the learners not only at our school but also almost throughout the country still obtain bad symbols. I am talking about learners from the previously disadvantaged schools. So how can we say our matric results are good*? *We all know that learners that always get good results are learners from the advantaged schools*.

Educators in school B argued that conditions in most disadvantaged schools are not conducive for good matric results when compared to the conditions in advantaged schools. According to these educators, the academic achievement of the learners from disadvantaged schools could only be improved if these schools are given all the necessary resources. An educator in school B expressed his opinion as follows:

> *The Department needs to be serious about addressing the imbalances of the past. They cannot expect our results (matric results of disadvantaged schools) to be as good as the results the advantaged schools. We are still working under different* conditions. *Believe me, the gap between these schools is still wide*.

Discussion

The school's product is the population of learners who have acquired the necessary skills, knowledge and attitudes to cope in a competitive world (Kruger, 2003a:253). Thus, learner achievement is one of the crucial aspects in the education system. For example, the matric pass rate provides a lot of useful insights about the functioning of system of education in South Africa. It assists in isolating good practice, bad practice and in identifying gaps in education practice in schools. It also shows what learners know, what they can do and what needs to be addressed to improve learner outcomes (Department of Education, 2005:3).

Statistics show that the national pass rate in matric 2005 was 68.3%. This was 2.4% down on 2004-pass rate which was 70.7%. The pass rate for KwaZulu-Natal was 70.5% for 2005 matric and this was 3.5% down on 2004-pass rate which was 74% (Department of Education, 2005:3). Although there has been some improvement in the matric results over the pass few years nationally and in some Provinces, the number of learners who obtain university entry from most disadvantaged schools has not significantly increased. Most learners from disadvantaged schools still pass with bad symbols.

Learners need to acquire appropriate knowledge, skills and attitudes in order to achieve the following basic aims of education: to develop their individual potential; to become good citizens, in other words, to contribute to society and to be economically active, in other words, to earn a living (Claassen, 1998:119). Killen (1999:16) concurs that when teaching is focused on learners' achievement of particular outcomes, it is necessary to consider the knowledge, skills, attitudes and preconceptions that learners have prior to instruction.

According to Kruger (2003b:7), a whole-school approach to improvement which includes all elements of the learning environment is the most effective approach to improving the school culture and learner achievement.

5.10.6 School infrastructure

For any institution to operate effectively there should be adequate infrastructure. This includes the quality of educators teaching various subjects/learning areas. Although in the case of the four

schools included in this study it was found that they all have suitably qualified educators, they all have inadequate infrastructures. This impacts negatively on teaching and learning.

The two supervisors interviewed in this study pointed out that almost all schools in KwaMashu have suitably qualified educators. But they also indicated that most schools that they had visited in the area have been vandalised in one way or another. As a result, in most cases, learners learn under deplorable conditions. For example, the principal of school C maintained that toilets in this school are not in working order. Similarly, an educator in school B also complained that most toilets in this school are dysfunctional. "*How can we work when most of the toilets are not working*?" an educator in school B asks.

Meanwhile, the principal and educators of school D maintained that supervisors were very impressed about the conditions of infrastructure in their school. However, one educator was quick to point out that does not mean that their school (school D) is better than other schools in the KwaMashu. This educator explained: "*All schools in this area (KwaMashu) are vandalised, particularly during school holidays. Most of the time when we come back from holidays we would find that something has been damaged or stolen*".

Both superintendents in this study confirmed that principals often make reports of the damages and/or vandalism that had taken place in their schools during the school holidays. These Departmental officials complain that the Department of Education spends a lot of money repairing damages that are made in schools, particularly in the townships. One superintendent added that once the damage has been made, principals and educators expect the Department of Education to quickly repair these damages. Another superintendent also indicated that vandalism is mostly caused by the fact that people (community members) do not own schools. This official explained this as follows:

> *The principal should work closely with the community so that people (community members) can own the school. If the community members own the school I am sure they would look after it. And these problems (break-ins, damages and vandalism) can be minimised.*

Discussion

Supervisors must make judgements and report on the effectiveness of the following: the sufficiency of suitably qualified and experienced educators and support staff; the amount of accommodation and its state of repair and suitability of the school's premises; the sufficiency and suitability of books and equipment for learning; the efficiency with which all the school's resources are used and the methods by which all the school and the school governing body ensure that they get value for money (cf 2.3.3.8).

For both the educators and learners, the school facilities need to promote rather than hinder the teaching and learning process. At the level of access, the school grounds, buildings and classrooms need to be accessible to all learners (including learners with disabilities who may require specifications that facilitate their access), safe (in terms of the physical and psychosocial environment) and conducive to effective teaching and learning (Davidoff & Lazarus, 2002:31). However, Whatford in Muijs et al (2004:166) argues that providing resources to ineffective schools may itself be an ineffective strategy as these schools do not have the management and leadership capacities to use these extra resources in a way that is likely to lead to improvement. Therefore, management capacity may have to improve before resources are put into failing schools.

5.10.7 Parent and community involvement

Effective teaching and learning can only be realised if parents at home and community members in the area surrounding the school support what is happening in the school. But all four principals interviewed in this study contend that neither the parents nor the community members support them in their endeavour to provide quality education. All educators agree with the principals that parents and community members in KwaMashu do not support schools and their children's education.

Both principals and educators argued that without parents and community members being supportive towards the school, learners can hardly develop a positive attitude towards their schoolwork and the school in general. According to both principals and educators, parents and community members do not have a positive interest in the education of their children. The principals and educators maintained that parents and community members do not attend meetings

when invited. The principal of school B contended that the only time that parents and community members attend meetings is when there is a problem. This principal explained this as follows:

> *These people always wait until the school has a serious problem. But when we invite them to meetings they do not come. You (the researcher) can see if we can close the school today and then call the parents' meeting tomorrow they can come in numbers. But when there is no problem they do not come. Only a few would come and surprisingly, parents that would come are the parents of the learners that do not give us problems.*

An educator in school D also confirmed that parents of learners who are problematic do not like to come to school even if they have been invited individually to address specific issues that directly involve their children. According to this educator, parents of these children would go to the extent of asking a friend or a neighbour to come to school on their behalf. As a result, in most cases, serious issues affecting the school and/or certain learners are not discussed because parents and community members do not want to participate in what is happening at schools, particularly in the disadvantaged schools. An educator in school A felt that a reason why parents and community members in disadvantaged schools and communities do not become involved in education is a feeling of inferiority due to poor educational background. "*Most of the time they shift everything to us (educators). They always say they do not know these things*", an educator in school A explained.

Both supervisors interviewed in this study confirmed that parents and/or community members do not want to take part in what is happening in schools. But both supervisors also indicated that this is not only the problem experienced by KwaMashu schools but it is a common problem experienced mostly in the previously disadvantaged schools. According to these supervisors, parents and/or community members have not taken the full ownership and responsibility in schools. As one supervisor explained: "*Parents and community members do not see schools as valuable parts of the community*". The principal of school A maintained that most of the time even the members of school governing bodies do not finish their terms of Office (cf 5.6.8).

Discussion

Parent involvement in disadvantaged communities is often difficult, as many parents and caregivers are struggling to survive and have little or no energy left for the social obligation such as becoming involved in school activities (Van Wyk, 2002:137).

Another problem which besets parents in disadvantaged communities in South Africa is the high level of illiteracy (Van Wyk, 2002:137). Because the majority of the parents in disadvantaged communities are illiterate, they are reluctant to participate in the school activities. As Van Wyk (2002:137) puts it, this obviously impacts on the role parents are able to play in decision-making. It also affects the relationship between the school, its educators and the community. Everard and Morris (1996:209) list the following as some of the skills that principals should acquire so that they can deal with parents, school governing bodies effectively: empathising with the other party; showing respect for them and their opinions; presenting the ideas and proposals from their standpoint; understanding their world and considering their self-interest and what they are trying to achieve by relating to the school.

5.11. COMPARISONS BETWEEN SCHOOL SELF-EVALUATION AND EVALUATION CONDUCTED BY SUPERVISORS

One of the purposes of school self-evaluation is to enable the school to prepare for external evaluation (Naicker & Webb, 2002:28). Therefore, it is important that self-evaluation conducted by the schools should be compared with the evaluation that is conducted by the supervisors in order to determine the differences and similarities between the two types of evaluations.

Schools cannot determine whether or not they are succeeding in achieving their objectives/goals without conducting self-evaluation. External evaluation conducted by external evaluators (supervisors) should follow school self-evaluation in order to verify whether the findings or results of school self-evaluation are valid or not. Thus, the task of the supervisors is mostly to validate the information that schools found during their internal evaluation (cf 5.8). According to both principals and educators, schools conducted self-evaluations prior to the external evaluations. But an educator in school B maintained that they did not have enough time to conduct self-evaluation. As a result they were not adequately prepared for the external evaluation (cf 5.8).

Both principals and educators in this study maintained that while there were areas where their findings during their school self-evaluations coincided with the findings of the supervisors during the external evaluations, there were other areas where the schools' findings did not coincide with the findings of the supervisors.

5.11.1 Similarities between the school self-evaluation and evaluation conducted by supervisors

The goal of evaluation is always school improvement and/or the provision of quality education (cf 1.1). Since both school self-evaluation and evaluation conducted by the supervisors use the instruments and also look at the same focus areas, they ought to have similarities. For example, the principal of school A contended that their findings did not differ much from what the supervisors (external evaluators) found during their visit to school A. This principal explained this as follows:

> *To our (staff members in school A) surprise, in some areas where we felt that we are lagging, the supervisors complemented us. They were very impressed by our efforts. This, really, boosted the morale of the educators. I am saying this because before they came every one thought that they were going to criticise everything here. Really, they were completely different from what we expected.*

Likewise, the principal of school D also maintained that there were a number of areas where their findings coincided with the findings of the supervisors. For example, the supervisors indicated that grade eight and nine are neglected and educators pay more attention to the senior classes. The principal had raised the issue on a number of times with educators. The principal also indicated that supervisors had complained that some educators still use the old way of teaching. However, this had been raised at a number of staff meetings. This principal explained:

> *There were a number of other areas where our findings during the internal evaluation coincided but I cannot remember all of them. But some of the things that they raised were the things that we (staff members in school D) were aware of but we did not pay much attention on them.*

According to the principal of school C both evaluations identified that school C had a problem with regard to record keeping, particularly financial management. The principal maintained that financial

management is one of the major areas that he needs assistance with. The supervisors maintained that most disadvantaged schools have a problem of financial management. However, these schools do not mismanage funds but lack the necessary skills in managing funds and keeping records.

Moreover, both the principal of school C and external evaluators shared concern about the response of the educators towards the bell. The response of both educators and learners towards the bell was discussed after their self-evaluation. According to the principal, educators in particular take time to go to class after the bell has been rung. The principal explained this as follows:

> *The supervisors identified this. They complained that both educators and learners do not respond swiftly to the bell. They said that the bell tells you that you should act. For example, the bell for changing periods tells you that you should start teaching the next class not that you should leave the staff room. Basically, educators should leave the staff room a few minutes before the bell rang. So, this is one of the things that both of us (self-evaluation and evaluation by the supervisors) picked up.*

The educators of school C agreed and added that this has been addressed. According to the principal and educators of school C, educators now move at least two minutes before the bell is rung so that they are in time for the next class. Both supervisors agreed it is a common problem that in most schools educators do not respond to the bell swiftly. According to these supervisors, educators tend to dawdle before going into the next class.

The principal of school B maintained that during their self-evaluation they realised that the school does not have appropriate and effective control systems to monitor and evaluate the work of the educators. According to the principal the supervisors also identified this. "*In fact, we (school B) have discussed this in our meetings but we had made no attempt to address it*".

Both supervisors interviewed in this study agreed that, in some cases, their findings tally with the findings of some schools. However, most educators still awarded themselves high scores in certain areas and the scores did not coincide with the scores given by supervisors after class observations (cf 5.7.1; 5.8).

Discussion

Evaluation conducted by the school and evaluation conducted by the supervisors revealed that there were areas of both similarities and differences. Schools maintained that they identified certain things before the evaluation by the supervisors but in most cases schools did nothing to address those areas.

Evaluation is meaningless unless what has been identified as weaknesses or areas that need attention is immediately addressed after evaluation has been conducted. Schools should have proper mechanisms in place to ensure that once areas that need development have been identified are addressed. The four principals maintained that they did not receive any training on whole-school evaluation. These principals, probably, did not know how to deal with the issues that have been identified during the self-evaluation.

5.11.2 Differences between the school self-evaluation and evaluation conducted by supervisors

Principals and educators maintained that a major difference between the school self-evaluation and the evaluation conducted by the external evaluators (supervisors) was that self-evaluation was conducted in a more relaxed manner while the external evaluation was a tense affair. They attribute this to the fact that self-evaluation was about ensuring that everything was in place before the external evaluation. Meanwhile, external evaluation was tense because people from outside conducted it. As one educator from school A put it: "*We did not know what to expect from these people*".

Supervisors participating in this study maintained that there were no major differences between school self-evaluation and the evaluation that they conducted. They maintained that both evaluations use the same instruments. But a supervisor was quick to point out that schools and supervisors always differ when it comes to scoring. According to the supervisor, educators rate themselves too low or too high since they have not been trained adequately on whole-school evaluation. As a result they do not understand scoring fully. Both supervisors contend that the other reason for high scores is that there is remuneration involved (cf 5.8).

The principal of school B maintained that supervisors pointed out that the school does not have democratic policies and procedures. The supervisors confirmed that in some schools policies and procedures were either not properly drawn-up or not drawn-up by all stakeholders. According to the principal of school B, in most cases, parents and educators are reluctant to participate in the drawing-up of the policies and procedures. As a result policies and procedures are normally drawn-up by the SMT. The other principals in this study concurred that parents and educators do not want to be involved when compiling school policies.

The principal of school D maintained that supervisors were impressed with the enthusiasm shown by their learners towards learning. However, the principal differed as he felt that most learners are not serious about their work. The supervisors made their judgement on the classes visited not the school as a whole. The principal, however, added: "*Probably, they (supervisors) were impressed by what was taking place in the classrooms. I know how learners behave. They have a tendency of trying to be impressive to the outsiders*".

According to the principal of school A, supervisors indicated that there is a need for them to translate the vision and mission statement of the school into the language of learner community. The principal contended that he never thought that it was necessary to use IsiZulu when writing the vision and mission statement of the school (cf 5.9.2). However, an educator in school A agreed that there was a need to use both English and IsiZulu in their vision and mission statement, as most of the parents and community members could not read English.

Discussion

Supervisors attribute the differences to the fact that some principals and educators did not receive training on whole-school evaluation. It is the responsibility of the Department to ensure that all principals and educators attend workshops whenever invited.

Supervisors also need to have the highest level of training and must have a more-than –adequate knowledge of curriculum issues for whole-school evaluation to be successful (cf 5.6.5). Whole-school evaluation will be successfully conducted if the schools and the supervisors work closely. According to Potterton (2004:71), the new guidelines on whole-school evaluation do provide more clarity and will go a long way to making the system work more fairly.

5.12 REPORTS ON WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION

Reporting the findings (strengths and areas that need development) to the stakeholders after the evaluation is very important. Therefore, supervisors must ensure that they give an oral report of their findings before the leave the school. An oral report should then be followed by a detailed written report, outlining the findings and providing the recommendations. According to the Department of Education (2001d:6), after the external evaluation, supervisors should provide two types of reports to the school, namely, an oral and a written report.

All principals and educators participated in this study maintained that they were given both an oral and a written report from the supervisors. According to the principal of school C, an oral report was just an overview of what the supervisors found out during their visit. This principal explained:

> *This (oral report) simply highlighted the things that they found out at our school. But they promised to forward another report which will give us detailed information about their findings. And they gave us a written report with recommendations within a short space of time.*

Supervisors maintained that they either give oral reports to the SMT or to the staff as a whole. In some schools they are asked to give an oral report to the whole staff. According to this supervisor, some schools prefer that supervisors address the staff members in order to enable them to direct their questions to the supervisors instead of addressing them to the SMT. Another supervisor mentioned that they are not prescriptive to schools. Schools decide how they should be given oral reports. "*But at times it is better if we give the whole staff the report because they can see that this is coming from us not from the SMT*", one of the supervisors said.

All principals participated in this study maintained that the team leaders gave them written reports within three to four weeks after the evaluations. According to these principals, these reports were detailed, identifying the achievements, strengths and (weaknesses) areas that need development, both on the part of the schools, as well as of the individual subject/learning area. Principals maintained that the findings of the supervisors were not biased and their recommendations were real. But the principal of school B was concerned about addressing the areas identified by the supervisors. This is how the principal expressed his concern:

> *Most of the things that were highlighted by the supervisors are the things that have been worrying us. But the problem is that you can't address these things without money. We, really, struggle even to address the basic needs. So it won't be easy for us to address these things without the outside help.*

All educators in this study maintained that their principals show them written reports from the external evaluators. They, however, indicated that nothing had happened in their schools in terms of addressing the areas identified by the supervisors. This should not be the case; schools cannot expect that only the Department can improve the schools.

Although reports of the supervisors given to these schools do not specify who should do what, things in these reports clearly show that they need to be attended to by the schools themselves. For example, in the case of the two primary schools, issues mentioned in the reports include: ensuring that the visions, mission statements and School Governing Bodies Constitution documents are available in the language of the learner community; having evaluation plans in place and encouraging parents to attend meetings. The report given to school C also indicated that a need to address the unhygienic conditions in the toilets and the classroom used for cooking. These things do not need the intervention of the Department. However, the reports identified aspects which need the intervention of the Department: the need for enough textbooks and educator and learner support materials (school A needs urgent repair of sewerage system; school C needs to repair the dilapidated classrooms).

As far as the secondary schools, the reports maintained that these schools need to formulate and develop policies that will assist in regulating late coming, truancy and absenteeism for both educators and learners; learners should be encouraged to speak, read and write in the language of teaching and learning (English); school should encourage parental support in school activities; and schools should have effective mandatory safety, security and discipline committees. These things mentioned in the reports given to the secondary schools do not require the support of the Department. The following areas, however, can only be addressed with the support of the Department: both secondary schools need laboratories; renovations; and educator and learner support materials. The report for school B indicates that toilets for boys and broken windowpanes, gutters and doors of classrooms need urgent attention.

Discussion

The written report must be given to the school by the external evaluation team within four weeks of the evaluation. It must reflect the oral report that was delivered and must identify the priorities that need to be addressed by the school in its improvement planning (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:31). It is, therefore, important that all stakeholders should not only read the report but should also take actions in terms of addressing areas identified in the report.

The evaluation report is presented in a standard format (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:31). This is very important because everyone should be able to read and understand its content. Thus, the report should be written in a clear language (Department of Education, 2001d:6). According to Naicker and Waddy (2002:31), the report should include the following: introduction; an overview of the findings and the main recommendations; key areas for evaluation and a review of subjects/learning areas/programmes.

5.12.1 Reaction of schools towards the reports of the supervisors

How schools will implement the recommendations of the supervisors will be determined by their reaction towards the reports of the supervisors. But the reaction of schools towards the reports is also influenced by a number of factors, for example, the attitude of schools (principals and educators) towards whole-school evaluation and the supervisors; how principals and educators understand whole-school evaluation and its implications on their daily lives and future; and the availability of resources and outside help.

But for schools to improve, areas identified by the supervisors as needing attention should be addressed. All role-players need to ensure that they perform their respective roles as expected. However, all schools that participated in this study maintained that they have not addressed the recommendations of the supervisors, except drawing up school improvement plans. Principals and educators claim that financial constraints prevent them from addressing the recommendations of the supervisors. As a result they expect the Department to do everything for the schools. But schools should not abdicate their own roles as whole-school evaluation aims at addressing their own needs.

5.12.1.1 The initial response of schools

According to the principals and educators who participated in this study, their understanding was that after whole-school evaluation had been conducted, they would draw up school improvement plans, submit these plans to the Department and the Department would address the areas identified by the supervisors as areas that need attention. As a result they expect the Department to fix up everything at their school. The principal of school D explained this as follows:

> *The supervisors gave us a report and the other report was given to the District Office with the recommendations but up to now we haven't seen anybody coming to us to discuss the findings and recommendations of the supervisors. Our understanding was that they (the Department) would provide schools with everything they need.*

According to the principals and educators who participated in this study, their first response was to conduct meetings to discuss the reports and to decide on the way forward. They maintained that they formed teams in their schools to deal with the logistics for drawing up the school improvement plans. These teams read the reports and recommendations made by the supervisors. The principal of school B explained: "*We sat down as a team and looked at the recommendations. We debated these issues and drew up a list of the things that should form part of our school improvement plan. We listed these things according to our priorities.*

Principals and educators regard planning for the drawing up of the school improvement plan as their first step after whole-school evaluation has been conducted. According to them, these plans detail how they were going to address the recommendations of the supervisors, as well the areas that they identified during school self-evaluations. An educator in school B maintained that they held regular meetings after whole-school evaluation, strategising how to ensure that their school improves. An educator in school C had the following to say:

> *My understanding was that our task after whole-school evaluation was to develop an improvement plan and submit it to the Department. The Department would take care of the rest. But we are not seeing the Department playing its part.*

Principals, however, pointed out that they did not expect the Department to do everything for their schools. For example, the principal of school B argued that schools cannot expect the Department to support them with discipline of learners. According to this principal, the issue of discipline needs the cooperation of the staff members and the parents. The principal explained: "*Supervisors complained that learners in our school smoke dagga and we have addressed that. I can tell you that have come to an end. To deal with those learners we didn't need the help of the Department*". The principal of school C concurred that there are things that schools can do without the support of the Department but adds that the support of the Department is greatly needed when money is involved, as well as for linking schools with private providers. This principal explained:

> *We can tackle certain needs on our own. For example, supervisors complained that there is no educator on duty during the breaks. They also complained that we don't have a ground duty policy. We have addressed that because it was within our scope. But we need the Department to support us financially as they promised. They said they would do everything once we have submitted our school improvement plan.*

All principals interviewed maintained that after the whole-school evaluation was conducted they gave reports of the findings and recommendations of the supervisors to the parents and guardians of the learners. According to the principals, this was done to ensure that all stakeholders have an input in the school for the benefit of the learners. But the principal of A was quick to say that there was a lack of parent involvement. "*Really, parents don't want to work with us*", the principal said.

Discussion

Within two weeks of receiving the written report the school must: send a summary to all parents/guardians of learners; send copies of the report to the District Office and the school must also use the report to guide it (the school) in producing a school improvement plan within four weeks of receiving the written report (Department of Education, 2001d:6; Naicker & Waddy, 2002:31).

All principals participated in this study maintained that they had complied with the above stipulations. They, however, indicated that they received no response from the District Office. As a

result the recommendations of the supervisors have not been addressed. It important that schools, particularly principals should do something to ensure that areas identified by the supervisors are addressed. Schools cannot afford to wait for the Department to right all wrongs in their schools. Principals are in charge of their schools, so they should see to it that their schools improve.

5.12.1.2 Developing a school improvement plan

The purpose of any evaluation is to identify strengths and areas that need development (weaknesses) in the organisation, including the school. But evaluation alone is not enough. Once evaluation has been done a development or improvement plan should be drawn up and most importantly implemented to address those areas that need improvement/development.

But all principals and educators who participated in this study maintained that although their schools have drawn up improvement/development plans, nothing has happened in terms of addressing areas identified by the supervisors as areas that need improvement. The four Department of Education officials who participated in this study confirm that the District Offices so far had not helped the schools addressing the needs of the schools. The four officials maintained that District Offices should draw up their improvement plans (district improvement plans) based on the improvement plans submitted to the District Offices by the schools. According to one of the four officials, the District Offices in their district improvement plans district should identify how they plan to assist schools with their school improvement plans.

One Department of Education official (a supervisor) regards the school improvement plan as a yardstick that a school should use to determine whether they are improving or not. According to this official, a plan helps the school to know how it should move from where it is to where it wants to be. This official contended that schools should always measure their performance so that they know their position. This official explained this as follows: "*Without an improvement plan schools would not know whether they are moving forward or backward*".

Meanwhile, the other supervisor maintained that schools should have improvement plans because when external evaluators conduct whole-school evaluation there are areas that they identify as areas that need to be improved or developed. But this official added that school improvement plan is not only to improve or develop areas identified during the external evaluation but also to improve areas

that schools identified during the internal evaluation. Moreover, the supervisor indicated that schools should not only blame the District Office for not helping them (schools) in addressing areas that need improvement but schools should address their own needs. A supervisor expressed her opinion as follows:

> *Schools should not shift all the blame to the District Offices. Some of the things identified in both self-evaluation and external evaluation need to be address by them* (*schools*). *So, how can they wait for District Offices to do everything for them*? *They need to play their part while complaining about District Offices.*

But principals and educators maintained that their understanding was that after whole-school evaluation has been conducted, schools would draw-up their improvement plans and submit those plans to the District Office. The District Office would then help the school in addressing those areas that had been identified by the supervisors as areas that need improvement/development. An educator in school A explained this as follows: "*We (schools) expect the Department (District Office) to help us in addressing the recommendations of the supervisors*".

The principal of school C also expressed his feeling about the fact that the issues that schools submit in their improvement plans are not being addressed. This principal blamed the Department of Education for failing to assist schools in addressing their needs. He said:

> *But we (school) were told to submit our school improvement plans so that we can get help. Yes, we sat down after the whole-school evaluation and drew-up a plan and submitted it to the Department (District Office) but up to now nothing has happened.*

According to the principals interviewed in this study, their improvement plans contain guidelines as how schools should be improved, for example, they indicate activities that need to done, strategies to be used, target areas, resources needed, time frames, performance indicators and people responsible for ensuring that these activities are done. Although none of the school improvement plans specify what role should the District Office play in addressing the areas/activities in the improvement plans, schools argue that their understanding was that after they have submitted their improvement plans to the District Office, School Project Groups were to be formed. According to

these schools, these School Project Groups were to be comprised of various stakeholders, including the District Support Team. Principals maintained that School Project Group would monitor the process of ensuring that the recommendations of the supervisors are implemented. All principals and educators in this study contend that although whole-school evaluation was conducted three to four years ago, they have never had a single meeting with the District personnel to discuss the recommendations of the supervisors. The principal of school D explained:

> *We* (*schools*) *were told that we will work together with the District Office to address these things* (*areas identified during school self-evaluation and the recommendations of the supervisors*), *but the District Office is not showing up*. *This puts you* (*the principal*) *in a difficult position because educators always look at you to make things happen*. *But, how can you make things happen if the District Office is not supporting you*?

Likewise, an educator in school D expressed her frustration as follows:

> *Really, this is frustrating because we were made to believe that after whole-school evaluation has been done, the report was going to be submitted to the District Office*. *Our understanding is that we should work together with the District Office for the improvement of the school. But this is not the case*.

But a superintendent insisted that schools and the District Offices should work together in addressing the recommendations of the supervisors and/or the areas that need development. According to this official, both the school and the District Office should know where the school stands and how it can move to where it wants to be. So schools should have school improvement plans. But this official like all other participants in this study maintained that in most cases school development plans are just on paper and not being implemented.

Discussion

According to Naicker and Waddy (2002:35), school improvement plan serves to: inform and guide the school towards improving itself; address the areas for development in the school; enable the school to become more effective as an institution of learning; enhance accountability by allowing

the school to take responsibility and ownership in addressing problem areas and encourage collective and collective co-operative responsibility. The school improvement plan should be based on the findings of the school during the school self-evaluation as well as the findings and the recommendations of the supervisors during the external evaluation.

The goal of evaluation is always school improvement and/or the provision of quality education (cf 1.1). Therefore, after internal evaluation by the school and external evaluation by the supervisors a proper school improvement plan should be drawn. For the school improvement plan to be successful, it must have the approval of all the stakeholders. Therefore, there must clear guidelines as what to be done and how each participant would be involved in the process.

5.12.1.3 The role of the principal in developing the school improvement plan

The school principal is the person that all staff members look to for advice, direction, guidance and assistance/support. Therefore, the principal needs to play a leading role, particularly during the times of change and/or uncertainty.

According to the supervisors who participated in this study, schools should draw-up their improvement plans based on their findings during the internal evaluations (school self-evaluations) as well as the findings of the external evaluators. According to the supervisors, schools map up or draw-up strategies indicating how schools are going to address the areas that they identified during the internal evaluations and areas that the supervisors identified as areas that need development/improvement. One of the two supervisors argued that schools can only improve not only if they have plans for improvement but also if they also ensure that they stick to the plans that they have drawn-up.

All participants in this study were of the opinion that the role that the principal should play in developing the school improvement plan is very crucial. But the principal of school D was worried that not much training has been offered to them in terms of strategic planning. As a result some principals struggle to put their plans on paper. Likewise, the principal of school A agreed and maintained that even the supervisors had indicated that staff members in school A have a problem with planning, especially long-term planning. This principal of school A, however, pointed out that he had played a leading role in drawing up a school development plan which was submitted to the

District Office but the school had received no response from it. The principal of school A maintained that the supervisors insisted that they must push the Department of Education, particularly the Circuit Office and the District Office to work. According to this principal, supervisors had told them (school A) that the Circuit Manager is judged by what is happening in schools in his/her circuit. But, in spite of the assurance by the supervisors that the Department of Education would address the recommendations, nothing has happened. As a result the school A has been unable to address the recommendations of the supervisors. This principal expressed his desperation as follows:

> *Really, this is very disturbing. These people (the supervisors) told us that if we take their report to the Department (Circuit Office/District Office) we are going to get help but we are getting no response from the Department. What is even worse is that people (staff members) look at me as if I am failing to do my duties. Really, one looks at the developmental appraisal system and whole-school evaluation as just the waste of time.*

The principal of school B contended that the principal and all staff members should work together developing the school development plan and prioritising areas for development. One superintendent maintained that principals should not decide alone but should involve other stakeholders for the benefit of their schools.

Meanwhile, one superintendent argued that schools should not wait for the District Office but the principals as heads of institutions must look for help from outside. According to this official, principals not the District Office are in a better position to know what their schools need in order to improve, as they know their problems better than the Department (Circuit Office/District Office). This official explained this as follows: "*Principals must look for people with expertise in various areas. In fact, most of them* (*principals) are doing that and their schools are improving*".

Meanwhile, one supervisor contended that principals, particularly principals of disadvantaged are unable to play a significant role in developing school improvement plans because of the limited funds. Moreover, principals in disadvantaged schools have a shortage of human resources and this sometimes makes it difficult for them to perform other roles effectively. According to this official, in some instances, principals in disadvantaged schools even have classes to teach and this is a

further responsibility on the part of the principal. The four principals confirmed this. According to these principals, having a class to teach adds a burden on the principals; as a result they sometimes do not do justice to other duties.

Likewise, the four officials who participated in this study were opposed to the idea that principals should have classes to teach. One of the two superintendents interviewed argued that principals as managers should not teach but should see to it that everything in the school runs smoothly. This official feels that it could be difficult for the principal to supervise if he/she is also expected to be in class. This official stated his opinion as follows: "*I do not see principals honouring their periods as they should also attend meetings, workshops and briefings and they are also always busy with other things in their schools*".

One of the two supervisors felt that there is no logic in letting principals teach while they also have to deal with other managerial roles. This official puts her argument as follows:

> *When I was a principal I used to teach but I could see that it was not working. Most of the time the principal is not at school. He/she attends meetings and workshops. Even when you are at school there is a lot to attend to. For example, Department officials visit the school now and then and you (the principal) have to attend to them. In fact, you have to deal with a lot of issues. So, when do you get the time to teach*?

The principal of school D concurred that principals do not have time to attend to a number of issues that need their attention. According to this principal, principals as managers should not teach. This principal maintained that while principals have an important role to play not only in developing the school improvement plan but also in ensuring that everything runs smoothly in the school, most principals do not perform their duties effectively. Moreover, the principal of school B maintained that principals can only draw up proper school improvement plans if they have the support of the Department (the Circuit Office and the District Office).

Discussion

Everybody involved in the school should make a contribution to what they think the performance goals of the school should be (Peters, 2004:36). Thus, the principal should encourage all stakeholders to play a role in the improvement of the school. Peters (2004:37) is of the opinion that the principal should regard every person as significant enough to contribute to the development of the school.

According to Naicker and Waddy (2002:36), the following are three key phases in a school improvement plan: planning, implementation and evaluation. The principal has a key role not only in ensuring that each individual knows his/her role but in also ensuring that each individual performs his/her role during all the three phases. Thus, the principal should always offer direction, guidance and support to all stakeholders so that these individual would have the ownership of the school improvement plan.

5.12.2 The response of the Department of Education towards the reports of the supervisors

The whole-school evaluation unit should submit a copy of the report to the District/Regional Office and the Province (Department of Education, 2001d:8). This is done in order for the Department to understand what support schools expect from the Department. This means that the Department has an important role to play in ensuring that schools carry the recommendations of the supervisors.

All participants in this study, however, maintained that the Department is not playing its role of supporting schools to address the recommendations of the supervisors. One superintendent argued that schools do self-evaluations and supervisors visit schools to conduct external evaluations and submit their reports of findings to the District Office. According to this superintendent, the District Office does not go to school to check what support schools require. "*I even doubt if the District Office has improvement plans for these schools*", the superintendent explained. A supervisor concurred that so far District Offices are ineffective in terms of addressing the recommendations that have been put forward by the supervisors.

Principals and educators contended that it is not only with whole-school evaluation that schools have problems regarding the support by the Department. For example, the principal of school C

maintained that after they have conducted the IQMS, they drew up a programme plan and informed the District Office through the Circuit Office that school C needed help from the Department but nothing happened. The principal of school B added that they all struggle to get support from the Department. According to this principal, the Department always contradicts itself. The principal explained himself as follows:

> *We (principals) were told that when we elect new members of the school governing bodies the Department was going to use the services of the Independent Electoral Commission (IEC) but at a later stage this changed. I, really, doubt if these people (the Department of Education) have long-term planning*.

This principal was concerned that when the Department fails to keep its promises, the blame goes to the principal not to the Department. The principal of school D agreed and gave an example where all schools in the KwaZulu-Natal were requested to submit learner information within a short space of time. The principal maintained that they were even told to suspend other activities and concentrate on this information. But they were told after a few days that the information was no longer needed. The principal expressed his frustration as follows: *Tell me*: *how do you tell the educators that the thing that you were pushing them to complete is no longer needed*? *This is very frustrating*. *Educators regard the principal as a failure not the Department*".

Discussion

The district support services are responsible for supporting the school in carrying out the recommendations of the report (Department of Education, 2001d:7). However, all participants in this study maintained that so far the District Office is not supportive. As a result nothing has happened in terms of addressing the recommendations of the supervisors.

Schools that participated in this study maintained that they submitted their school improvement plan to the District Office through their Circuit Office. But they have received no response from the District Office. Nongogo (2004:51) is of the opinion that a large number of districts are unable to support schools because they are under-capacitated in terms of staffing, infrastructure, systems and resources. This impacts negatively on the support and development of schools.

5.13 PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED IN ADDRESSING THE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE REPORTS

All principals and educators interviewed in this study are of the opinion that if the recommendations of the supervisors can be properly implemented in their schools, they can be greatly improved. But they pointed out that they face difficulties when trying to address these recommendations. Both principals and educators list the following as some barriers to implementation of the recommendations made by the supervisors.

5.13.1 Lack of funds

Both principals and educators interviewed maintained that lack of funds always make their work extremely difficult. They correctly point out that no institution can operate effectively without the necessary funds. The principal of school C maintained that at times it becomes difficult to plan knowing well that the school has no funds to implement that plan. It is not surprising that the four schools chosen in this study appear to have no proper strategies in place to address the findings and recommendations of the external evaluators. The four principals in this study maintained that they have drawn up their school improvement plans. But all of them are uncertain as to how their plans would be implemented because of shortage of funds. All four principals unanimously maintained that they find it difficult to attend to their school improvement plans because they have limited funds. These principals are of the opinion that it is a futile exercise to draw up a school improvement plan if it is not going to be implemented. The principal of school D also indicated that schools were under the impression that after having drawn up their school improvement plan and submitted it to the district, assistance would be forthcoming.

All educators interviewed in this study contended that very little had been done to address the areas identified by the external evaluators as areas that need attention. An educator in school B attributed this to the fact that the Department of Education has either no or ineffective monitoring systems to determine whether the findings and recommendations of the external evaluators are being addressed. Likewise, an educator in school D maintained that after supervisors had conducted the whole-school evaluation (external evaluation), no follow-up was made. One educator in school B summed this up as follows:

> *My observation is that very little happened after the supervisors. I would think that after their recommendations we would have worked hard to ensure that when they come back they would find us in a better position. But I think what causes this is that people know that there would be no follow-ups anyway. Educators know how Department operates. They always promise to come back and they would never come back. I think that is the reason why educators do not take these recommendations seriously. As a result there has been no improvement in the school.*

An educator in school D maintained that although they had meetings after the external evaluation strategising as how to address the recommendations of the supervisors, they never implemented what was agreed upon. Another educator in school B supported the recommendations of the supervisors but indicated that they do not have enough funds to address these recommendations. Likewise, the principal of school D contended that due to financial constraints they are unable to address all recommendations.

Discussion

Lack of funds in the schools that participated in this study has been regarded as one of the factors that hinder effective teaching and learning in these schools.

In order to provide quality education for growing number of children in the country, budgets have to be credible, valid and reliable, directed towards redress and equity (Prinsloo, 2002:59). Although the government and the Department of Education are attempting to address the imbalances of the past, most disadvantaged schools still maintain that they do not have enough funds to provide quality education.

5.13.2 Lack of District support

Whole-school evaluation can only be successful if all stakeholders support it. Like all other stakeholders the District Office has a significant role to play in ensuring that whole-school evaluation does not fail. But all principals and educators interviewed in this study are not satisfied with the role that the District Office plays in whole-school evaluation. Principals and educators

maintained that they are getting no assistance from the District Office. An educator in school A contended that the District Office does absolutely nothing to help the school. Another educator in school A vented his anger as follows: "*The District Office is doing nothing for us*. *But we are expected to deliver*. *How can you deliver without resources*?"

According to one educator in school C, the understanding of the educators was that after whole-school evaluation the Department of Education through District Offices would assist schools to ensure that the recommendations of the external evaluators were implemented. An educator in school C also pointed out that no assistance is forthcoming from the District Office and thus it is difficult for them to implement the recommendations of the external evaluators. This educator expressed her anger as follows: "*The Department officials are good at criticising us but when you ask for assistance from them you can hardy get it*. *By this I am trying to tell you that the Department is providing no support at all*".

Likewise, an educator in school D maintained that nothing has happened so far in terms of assistance from the District Office. According to this educator, school D never heard anything from the Department of Education since whole-school evaluation was conducted. This educator summed her disappointment: "*But we (schools) were promised that after whole-school evaluation we would be getting help from the Department*". Another educator in school D also adds that educators were not even certain if the report with the recommendations of the supervisors was submitted to the Provincial Office. This educator explained herself as follows: "*I am not sure if the Department at Provincial level even knows what kind of help our school expects from them*".

Likewise, the two superintendents interviewed in this study doubted if schools would get assistance from the District Offices. One of the superintendents maintained that the District Office should analyse the report for each school and identify common areas that need to be developed or improved. According to this official, the District Office should identify the challenges or developmental areas facing most schools. Based on these challenges or areas that need development the District Office should provide assistance. "*But we do not see this happening*", the official said. The other official (superintendent) also confirmed that the District Office is supposed to draw up a plan of how the District Office is to address the recommendations made by the supervisors. But this official also doubted if the District Offices help schools. This official explained:

> *My understanding is that after a few years the supervisors have to come back to check if their recommendations have been addressed or not. But my worry is that so far most District Offices have done nothing in terms of helping schools as suggested in the recommendations of the supervisors.*

The two supervisors interviewed in this study also maintained that District Offices have not yet supported schools in their development plans. One of the supervisors felt that this is the area that needs to be attended to. According to this supervisor, District Offices ought to attend to the areas that supervisors have identified as areas that need development. For example, if they have recommended that educators need certain skills, the District Office should speak to the skills section personnel to come to develop educators on skills identified by the supervisors (cf 5.6.9). "*But this (attending to the recommendations of the supervisors) is not happening*", the supervisor said.

Discussion

The fact that the District Office is not assisting the schools not only to realise the goals of the whole-school evaluation but also to improve in general compounds the problem, as most schools particularly those that are in the disadvantaged schools cannot afford to support themselves financially either.

The district support team must link with the school management team, the staff and the school governing bodies in order to support the implementation of the quality improvement strategies recommended by the supervisors and identified in the school's improvement plan (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:20-21). The support that the district can provide to schools can play a significant role in ensuring that schools meet their ever-changing challenges. Moloi (2002:xiv) argues that the failure of schools to achieve their goals is exacerbated by poor support from District Offices which provide no management development programmes to these schools.

5.13.3 Lack of clarity on the role of the Circuit Offices

Circuit Offices are closer to the schools and are in constant contact with the schools. The Circuit Offices' proximity with the schools makes it easier for the Circuit Offices not only to know schools better but also to understand and know the needs and strengths of the schools.

But the role that should be played by the Circuit Offices in whole-school evaluation is not clearly stated. As a result the two superintendents who participated in this study indicated that they do not know what is actually happening in the schools in terms of the implementation of whole-school evaluation. These officials maintained that as far as they know the District Office communicates with the schools directly and the Circuit Office's role is minimal. According to one of the officials, the District Office only involves the Circuit Offices when the District Office needs information from schools. This official explained:

> *Once we have supplied them with that information they then deal with schools on their own. But, honestly, we (the Circuit Offices) do not see the District Office addressing the problems that have been identified by the schools and/or the supervisors.*

The official added that because of the shortcomings of the District Office, the Circuit Offices try to assist schools where possible. For example, schools are advised to look for outside help (cf 5.6.9). But this official quickly pointed out that asking schools to look for outside help is not in the management plan of whole-school evaluation. According to this official, the management plan of whole-school evaluation involves the school and the Department of Education at the district, the Province and the National level. This official observed:

> *But what happens is that after the supervisors have conducted the external evaluation schools make their school improvement plans and submit them to us (the Circuit Office). We then submit these plans to the District Office and after that nothing happens.*

Likewise, the other superintendent agreed that the Circuit Offices only come in where the District Office has a problem with the school/s, for example, when the District Office could not locate the school and/or when the principal is not at school. Both officials maintained that the Circuit Offices are not directly involved in whole-school evaluation. As a result they have limited information as far as what is happening in schools with regard to whole-school evaluation.

The principal of school C also confirmed that the role of the Circuit Office is not clear and this makes it difficult for them to address the findings and recommendations of the supervisors.

According to this principal, what compounds the problem is that the District Office is far away from KwaMashu area and schools are not always allowed to go to the District Office directly. As this principal puts it: "*Sometimes we are expected to communicate with the district via the Circuit Office. This creates problems because the Circuit Office knows very little about whole-school evaluation*". Meanwhile, the principal of school D argues that if the Circuit Office had a clearly defined role in whole-school evaluation things would be better because the Circuit Office is closer to the schools. According to this principal, it would have been easier for the Circuit Office (ward managers) to visit schools on a regular basis. For example, ward managers would have visited schools to help them with their development/improvement plans.

Discussion

Although the district support team members are major players in the evaluation process, other officials, such as the school's superintendent Education Management and Subject and Phase advisors should actively assist the district (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:22). However, the role of the Circuit Offices in whole-school evaluation is not explicitly stated.

All participants in this study are of the opinion that the role of the Circuit Offices in whole-school evaluation is not quite clear. This has a negative impact in the implementation of whole-school evaluation since schools always look to the Circuit Offices for guidance.

5.13.4 Lack of training in whole-school evaluation of principals

For any policy to be effectively implemented all role-players need to be thoroughly trained. But with regard to whole-school evaluation, all principals interviewed in this study maintained that they had undergone no training whatsoever. Lack of training for principals makes their role in whole-school evaluation very problematic.

Both principals and educators interviewed maintained that the findings and recommendations of the supervisors have yet not been attended to and all principals and educators interviewed blamed the District Office for this. The lack of training of principals in whole-school evaluation is a contributory factor as principals find it difficult to address the findings and recommendations of the supervisors. The principal of school B believed that the fact that they received no training in whole-

school evaluation had a bearing on how they perform their role in whole-school evaluation. This principal maintained that some educators had received training in whole-school evaluation. This principal, however, indicated that the training was a 'crash course' and educators in his school claimed that they did not benefit much from the workshop. An educator in school C also confirmed that workshops organised by the Department of Education for whole-school evaluation were not fruitful. This educator maintained that facilitators were not competent.

Meanwhile, the principal of school C maintained that even though he did not attend the workshop organised by the Department of Education for whole-school evaluation his school was involved in another programme. This principal maintained that this programme helped them to understand their strengths and weaknesses even before whole-school evaluation was introduced. Moreover, the principal maintained that whole-school evaluation came with the same idea learned during the programme that they were involved in (cf 5.4.1). The principal of school C had the following to say: "*But other than that programme that our school was involved in I did not go to any training or workshop on whole-school evaluation*". Although principals interviewed in this study claimed that they attended no training/workshop on whole-school evaluation, the two supervisors interviewed in this study disputed this. According to these officials (the two supervisors), workshops specifically for whole-school evaluation were organised for principals through the Province of KwaZulu-Natal (cf 5.6.3).

But the supervisors could not agree on how many workshops were organised for the principals in the Province and/or in each district. However, both agreed that workshops took less than three days. This indicates a lack of training for principals in whole-school evaluation. This has a bearing on how principals could deal with the implications of whole-school evaluation in their schools.

Discussion

School principals need extensive training not only in whole-school evaluation but also in all other policies and reforms introduced in the country. Principals need to have a clear knowledge and understanding of these new initiatives in order to be able to pass them to their staff members. Such knowledge and understanding would also enable school principals to manage their schools effectively.

Training should be seen as an investment and it should be remembered that the greatest cost element in training someone is his or her time or that of the equivalent supply educator. On this basis it is false economy to save money on course fees if staff will then be taught less efficiently (Everard & Morris, 1996:200).

5.14 LESSONS LEARNT FROM THE IMPLEMENTATION OF WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION

All principals and educators interviewed in this study maintained that they learnt something from whole-school evaluation. Moreover, the supervisors contended that they also learn something new whenever they conduct whole-school evaluation. This indicates that learning takes place in both ways.

An educator in school A indicated that the external evaluators indicated that they indeed learnt something from staff members. According to an educator in school B, most things emphasised by the external evaluators were the things that they ought to be doing. This educator was, however, quick to exonerate the educators maintaining that their major problem is the lack of resources. This educator put it out as follows:

> *But the problem is that the school does not have resources to carry out our work effectively. If we were getting support from the Department I am sure that we would be able to do our work effectively as suggested by the external evaluators*.

An educator in school C also agreed that most things requested by the supervisors were the things that they know they should do, but they have tended to be complacent about improvement. This educator explained this as follows: "*It is common that as you (a person) go along with your work you tend to ignore some of the important but minor things. So I believe that the supervisors gave us a wake-up call*".

Another educator in school C was concerned about the manner in which the Department of Education functions. According to this educator, the Department of Education has no mechanisms to monitor their programmes. This educator maintained that most of the initiatives of the Department of Education fail because they are not monitored. An educator in school C said:

> *I am not sure whether it's because they (the Department of Education) lack the manpower to monitor their programmes or they do this deliberately. But this has a negative impact on the teaching and learning. I am saying this because most of us do not do justice to our work because we know that no one from the Department will constantly visit schools to check if policies are being implemented.*

Likewise, an educator in school D argues that although they learnt a lot from the supervisors, the whole process becomes useless when no one is monitoring if what was learnt and/or suggested by the supervisors is being implemented. According to this educator, what counts most is what happens after whole-school evaluation has been conducted. This educator expressed her desperation as follows: "*Really, I had high hopes about whole-school evaluation but I was shocked to see nothing happening after it was conducted. I think I have learnt a lesson that nothing happens if there is no one to monitor the project*". The principal of school B questioned the intention of evaluation (whole-school evaluation) if no support and/or assistance is to be offered to the schools. Against this background one educator in school D judged the whole process of whole-school evaluation as an exercise in futility.

Meanwhile, the two supervisors pointed out that they were surprised that discrepancies still exist among the schools. According to these officials, some schools are still poorly resourced and this has an impact on the performance of both the educator and the learner. One supervisor explained this as follows: "*Although KwaMashu is the township which is close to the town (Durban), some schools here are worse than some schools in the rural areas*".

Discussion

As a new process, it is important that whole-school evaluation should bring new meaning to all individuals involved in its implementation. This new meaning would be a driving force to these individuals in relation to changing their normal way of doing things and/or seeing the need of making improvement in their schools.

For both parties (the schools and the supervisors) to learn meaningfully, they should not have preconceived ideas before the whole-school evaluation is conducted. According to some educators

in this study, if whole-school evaluation can be properly conducted it can be a useful tool t to revive the culture of teaching and learning in most schools, particularly the disadvantaged schools.

Conclusions on the implementation of whole-school evaluation

Effectively implemented whole-school evaluation should lead to effective teaching and learning. Once the evaluation has been conducted and results have been analysed, something should be done with the results.

Surprisingly, all the participants in this study maintained that after whole-school evaluation nothing happened. If this is the case, this implies that the whole process was a futile exercise. The main purpose of whole-school evaluation is to facilitate improvement of school performance through approaches characterised by partnerships, collaboration, mentoring, guidance and support (cf 5.6.2). Therefore, whole-school evaluation should be followed by an action plan, that is, a school improvement plan.

5.15 WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION AND DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS

Whole-school evaluation and its processes should be understood within the context of schools in which it is implemented or conducted. For example, a well-resourced school is more likely to implement whole-school evaluation better than the poorly resourced school (cf 2.7). Therefore, supervisors should take the context of schools into account when conducting whole-school evaluation in order to be able to base their findings not only on their expectations but also to consider the context of each school.

The National Policy for Whole-School Evaluation recognises that whole-school evaluation should not disadvantage schools that are in disadvantaged areas. Individual circumstances should always be taken into account (Naicker & Waddy, 2002:14). According to the external evaluators (supervisors), whole-school evaluation is done in order to, among the other things, assist schools to move out of their present positions. This implies that if whole-school evaluation is conducted effectively and the recommendations of the supervisors are effectively addressed, disadvantaged schools can benefit from it (whole-school evaluation).

5.15.1 The distinction between advantaged and disadvantaged communities/schools

All participants contend that a clear distinction between advantaged and disadvantaged communities or schools can be judged by their economic income. According to these participants, disadvantaged communities and/or schools are those that cannot sustain themselves economically.

According to one of the supervisors who participated in this study, most disadvantaged schools are in rural areas and townships. Meanwhile, most advantaged schools can be found in towns, for example, the former Model C schools. But one of the superintendents contended that not all schools in rural areas can be regarded as disadvantaged schools. According to this official, there are schools in the rural areas that can be regarded as advantaged schools. This official is of the opinion that the determining factor should be whether parents can afford to support their children financially or not. As a result this official maintained that the distinction between the advantaged school and the disadvantaged school is how the community and the parents are able to sustain the quality of education in the community. This official explained himself as follows:

> *The fact is that parents who are unemployed cannot be able to support their children financially. So such learners are disadvantaged no matter where they are. On the other hand you may find that learners in rural areas have parents who are employed. So these parents can support their children financially.*

But one of the external evaluators disagreed with her colleague and argued that there is no school that can be regarded as advantaged in the rural areas. This official bases her argument on her observations during external evaluators' visits to conduct whole-school evaluation. The official maintained that even though some schools in rural areas and townships may have attractive buildings that does not imply that they are advantaged. The official explained: "*Most of the schools that I have visited in the rural areas as well as in the townships look beautiful but when you get inside you find that the school is empty. There are no resources at all*".

The principal of school A raised his concern that when the Department of Education speaks about disadvantaged schools, it always refers to schools in rural areas. According to this principal there are many disadvantaged schools in the townships as well. For example, most schools in townships do not have resources at all. "*There are schools here at KwaMashu that have no resources*," the

principal of school A said. Likewise, one of the superintendents contended that the mistake that the Department of Education at higher level makes is that advantaged schools are those with tarred roads leading to them, flush toilets and running water. "*But the fact of the matter is that most of these schools cannot be able to sustain themselves economically*", the official said. According to an educator in school B, unlike the advantaged school, a disadvantaged school does not have a library, laboratory and other necessary resources. An educator in school D explained this as follows: "*You cannot expect an advantaged school to cope with changes in the same manner as a disadvantaged school. Disadvantaged schools struggle because they do not have enough resources*".

Discussion

No meaningful comparison/s can be made among children coming from very different communities with different backgrounds. Well-to-do parents provide their children advantages that children of the poor never receive (Eisner, 1994:6). The background of each child has a positive or negative impact on the schooling of that particular child.

A large percentage of South African youth grow up in poverty-stricken circumstances. The effects on children raised in an environment characterised by low economic and social status, poor education, unemployment and limited community involvement in education is diverse (Lemmer, 1998:38-39). Likewise, Prinsloo (2002:66) maintains that education in poverty stricken communities of South Africa is hampered by a lack of order in the communal structures, vandalism, negative peer group influence, a non stimulating milieu, poor orientation towards school and clashes between the value orientations of the family and the school.

5.15.2 Understanding of disadvantaged schools

For any school to function effectively it is important that all stakeholders should not only know the status of the school but should also know how to assist the school to achieve its objectives. Stakeholders should know what makes their school unique to other schools.

With regard to this study, all participants indicated that schools in KwaMashu are disadvantaged. Participants, however, also highlighted that schools are disadvantaged in different ways. As an educator in school A put it: "*Some schools are better than others in terms of resources. But that*

does not mean that they (KwaMashu schools) are advantaged. They are just disadvantaged like us". Likewise, an educator in school C maintained that a disadvantaged school is a school that cannot meet its educational needs because neither the school nor the parents can afford to meet those needs. "*Such schools struggle to make the ends meet*", another educator in school C added. Another educator in school C added that their school is categorised as a disadvantaged school because of the feeding scheme in their school. According to this educator the feeding scheme was initiated to help learners whose parents cannot afford to provide their children with pocket money to buy food for lunch and/or learners who cannot afford to carry lunch boxes because of their financial background. This educator explained his opinion as follows: "*As I am talking right now there are many bags of food lying in one of the rooms. This is an indication that our school (school C) is disadvantaged*".

The principal of school A maintained that most of the learners in school A come from families that cannot afford schools that charge high school fees. According to this principal, their school fees aim at accommodating learners who come from poor families. An educator in school D confirmed that learners in disadvantaged schools are disadvantaged in a number of ways. For example, learners come from poor families; families that are disadvantaged and they attend schools that are disadvantaged. According to an educator in school B, this results in a number of dropouts from the disadvantaged schools. The other factor that contributes to dropout is the family background. In most cases, learners attending disadvantaged schools come from very poor families and these families do not provide the learner with the opportunity to learn. For example, Van Wyk and Lemmer (2006:8) maintain that in some instances, many family members share a house or a shack. In such overcrowded conditions, learners struggle to find adequate space, light and privacy required to complete homework activities or study for tests or exams. The option that such learners have is to leave the school.

Discussion

Understanding of disadvantaged schools and the conditions under which they operate is very important so that one can be able to understand the problems of the learners in these schools.

Learners in disadvantaged schools are disadvantaged by the environment and often are characterised by a poor self-concept, limited motivation, perceptual deficiencies, poor creativity, an obscured future perspective and confusion about social and cultural norms (Lemmer, 1998:39). As

the long-term patterning of educational inequality looks set to remain, leaders in schools facing challenging circumstances must look for strategies and approaches that might assist their schools, in context with their learners (Muijs et al, 2004:169).

5.15.3 The impact of educational changes on the disadvantaged schools

All participants that were interviewed in this study maintained that educational changes taking place in South Africa have a negative impact on the disadvantaged schools. According to these participants, these changes do not address the problems that they are intended to address.

Both the principals and educators maintained that it becomes difficult for them to implement most of the changes because their schools do not have the necessary resources. The principal of school A contended that in most cases these changes still benefit the previously advantaged schools. According to this principal, previously advantaged schools have the necessary resources as a result they do not have many problems when implementing these policies. An educator in school C argued that there has been not much change in the disadvantaged schools. This educator said: "*As it is most schools in the area (KwaMashu) are still disadvantaged*". An educator in school C asserted that their school as well as other schools in KwaMashu still struggle to implement changes. This educator said that previously disadvantaged schools still lag behind when compared to the former model C (previously advantaged) schools.

Likewise, an educator in school D contended that educational changes place a lot of demands on the schools which many disadvantaged schools struggle to cope with. This educator maintained that most of these changes still favour the previously advantaged schools. Another educator in school D agreed:

> *In fact, most disadvantaged schools fail to cope with these changes. And I think that these changes add a burden on the disadvantaged schools. It would have been better if these changes were introduced gradually.*

Another educator in school D expressed her concern that the Department of Education comes with a number of changes but schools are not provided with the mechanisms to implement them. This creates problems for the disadvantaged schools because the Department of Education expects them

to deliver but disadvantaged schools have no mechanisms to enable them to do so. As a result educational changes often impact negatively on the disadvantaged schools. The principal of school A confirmed that a number of disadvantaged schools still do not have basic amenities: electricity and photocopying machines. This principal is of the opinion that without these basics, no school can successfully implement these changes and cope with demands on schools. This principal explained:

> *The Department talks about norms and standards (the money allocated to the schools by the Department of Education) but that money is too little compared to the needs of schools. So if the school does not have electricity educators end-up frustrated. How can you operate without electricity? I know one or two schools here at KwaMashu that do not have electricity. But the Department expects us to implement these changes/policies.*

Meanwhile, the principal of school D acknowledged that educational changes introduced in South Africa are meant to improve the quality of teaching and learning. But this principal quickly added that because these policies are numerous, they do not achieve what they intend. This principal contended that even if educators have a will to implement the change, they are frustrated because disadvantaged schools do not have resources to implement such changes. This principal explained:

> *I would say, in most cases, these changes do not help the disadvantaged schools just because most disadvantaged schools do not have tools to implement these changes. I think what the Department should do is to ensure that disadvantaged schools have the necessary resources before coming up with a lot of changes. Otherwise, these changes seem to be helping the advantaged schools to improve whilst disadvantaged schools become worse. For example, if you go to an advantaged school you can find that the school has all the resources. So whatever they do they do it practically.*

Likewise, both superintendents interviewed in this study are of the opinion that educational changes introduced have a negative impact on the disadvantaged schools. These two officials contended that these changes put too much pressure on the disadvantaged schools. As a result disadvantaged schools have to struggle to meet the demands of the Department of Education without or with limited resources to implement the educational changes/policies. According to one of the two

superintendents, the Department of Education provides very little to ensure that schools fulfill the demands made by these policies. As a result the changes do not benefit the disadvantaged schools as intended.

What is said by participants with regard to the impact of educational changes on the disadvantaged schools indicates that Departmental initiatives, including whole-school evaluation are unlikely to achieve their intended goals. Most changes in South African schools aim at ensuring that disadvantaged schools move out of their present positions. But disadvantaged schools are not benefiting from these changes. What compounds the problem as far as whole-school evaluation is concerned is that schools also complain of not getting any assistance from the District Office. Without assistance from the Department and/or the Non-Governmental Organizations disadvantaged schools will not improve or benefit from the changes.

Discussion

The education challenge within South Africa is largely framed by the economic challenges facing the nation. The economic challenges are characterised most starkly by deep inequalities, high levels of poverty and unemployment and slow economic growth (Prinsloo, 2002:56). As a result most of the changes being introduced in the country impact negatively on the disadvantaged communities and/or schools.

De Clercq (1997a:127) warns that these policies are in danger of creating conditions that will assist the privileged education sector to consolidate its advantages while making it difficult for the disadvantaged to address their problematic educational realities (cf 1.2). This confirms what participants indicated that these changes do not benefit disadvantaged schools as it is intended.

5.15.4 The managerial role of school principals in disadvantaged schools

The environment in which one operates has a big influence on how one can perform one's roles. Therefore, it is important that a person should have a clear understanding of the environment and the surroundings so that he/she can perform his/her role/s accordingly.

All participants in this study maintained that the managerial role of the principal of disadvantaged school is very demanding. According to these participants, the principal of a disadvantaged school has little support from a number of stakeholders. For example, the principal of school A contended that a principal of a disadvantaged school has a big problem because he/she has very little support from the parents/community. This principal adds that a principal of an advantaged school has the support of the parents. As a result the managerial role of the principal of an advantaged school is that of being the overseer. The principal of school C confirmed that principals of disadvantaged schools always struggle to ensure that effective teaching and learning take place in the schools. The principal of school C felt the fact that most community members in general and parents in particular are not well-educated and do not see the great need of taking part in the education of their children. This principal explained this as follows:

> *They (parents) leave everything to the school. Even when we (the school) call them with an aim of initiating programmes that can help the learners through them (parents) they do not turn-up. In this community, parents I would say regard education as something that belongs to the learners and the educators.*

Likewise, the principal of school D indicated that the principal of a disadvantaged school does almost everything without or with limited support personnel. This principal compared the managerial role of the disadvantaged school with that of the principal of an advantaged school, whereas, the principal of an advantaged school, often has a number of support staff. For example, principals in advantaged schools have financial officers, a number of administration clerks and sometimes they even have secretaries (personal assistants). The principal of school D explained: "*This makes the work of the principal of an advantaged school easier than the work of the principal of a disadvantaged"*.

Likewise, both superintendents were of the opinion that unlike the principal of an advantaged school, the principal of a disadvantaged school works under difficult conditions. For example, disadvantaged schools do not have enough resources and sometimes have nothing at all as a result these principals struggle to get things done. A superintendent pointed out that, in most cases, skilled individuals surround principals of advantaged schools and this facilitates their work. This official also added that, in some instances, in disadvantaged schools many staff members are not well trained and this adds a burden on the principals. This official summed it up as follows:

> *The principal of a disadvantaged school does almost everything. The main problem is that their schools have no resources. But advantaged schools have almost all the facilities and the task of principal of advantaged schools is to ensure that these facilities are well maintained.*

The external evaluators also regarded the managerial role of the principal of a disadvantaged school as influenced by a number of factors. According to one of the external evaluators who participated in this study, in some instances, the principal of a disadvantaged school has a class to teach (cf 5.12.2.1). As a result this principal ends up not concentrating on his/her managerial roles because he/she has to ensure that the class that he/she teaches does well in order to boost the morale of other staff members. An educator in school C points out that in most disadvantaged schools where there are support personnel, they have administration clerks but they do not have financial officers and other support personnel. As a result the principal of a disadvantaged school ends up doing everything.

The principal of school A also maintained that the principal of a disadvantaged school has a problem acquiring sponsorships. Whereas, principals of advantaged schools are able to acquire sponsorships from the private sector. This principal expressed his opinion as follows:

> *I think this is because advantaged schools have long established connections with the private sector and most of the managers in the big companies were schooled in these advantaged schools. As a result they (company managers) would always like to sponsor their former schools.*

Discussion

The managerial role of the disadvantaged school principal needs to be understood in its correct context so that everyone should know what to expect from this principal.

All participants in this study maintained that the managerial role of the disadvantaged school principal is very problematic because he/she does not have the support of stakeholders. This lack of support has a negative impact on the implementation of whatever changes are being introduced. Unlike their counterparts in the advantaged schools, some principals of disadvantaged schools also

have classes to teach. Having a class to teach being principal compromises either the class or the managerial role of the disadvantaged school principal. However, Boyd (1996:67) maintains that some experts believe that the best way for principals to become instructional leaders is to be active in the classroom.

5.15.5 Helping disadvantaged schools to improve

It is very important that people with interest in education should try their best to ensure that disadvantaged schools are helped in order for them to move out of their disadvantaged positions. Disadvantaged schools alone, without the help of the Department of Education, private providers and other Non-Governmental Organisations cannot move out of their present positions.

Educators participating in this study maintained that their principals are doing their best to ensure that their schools improve. But the problem is that sometimes the Department does not provide adequate support to the principals for them to do their work effectively. Educators are of the opinion that disadvantaged schools can only improve if they can get support from the Department as well as from the private providers. An educator in school D is concerned that so far the Department is not providing genuine support to disadvantaged schools. This educator explained: "*The* Depa*rtment must provide genuine support to schools, particularly to the disadvantaged schools because those schools are struggling*". Another educator in school A concurs, arguing that it is still going to take time to eliminate disparities that exist between advantaged schools and disadvantaged schools as the private sector still favours advantaged schools. An educator in school C maintained that this helps advantaged schools secure their status whilst disadvantaged schools remain disadvantaged.

The principal of school A also confirmed that much as they (disadvantaged schools) try their best to look for assistance from the companies, they are reluctant to assist disadvantaged schools. This principal is of the opinion that most companies do not have confidence in the principals of disadvantaged schools. Likewise, the principal of school C maintained that much as they try to move their school to a better position, lack of funds prohibits them from making improvements in the school. This principal also contended that it is very difficult for them (disadvantaged schools) to get help from outside. "*I also try to get help from the NGOs (Non-Governmental Organisations) but they seem not willing to assist us*", the principal of school C said. The principal of school D also

maintained that the problem that is faced by the disadvantaged schools is that companies are not willing to forge partnership with the disadvantaged schools. This principal explained:

> *We are trying to get assistance from the private companies. But the problem is that it is difficult to get funds from the private companies. In fact, private companies are still helping the advantaged schools. So one finds it difficult to move the school out of its present position. What I am trying to say it that because most disadvantaged schools have little contact with the private companies it is not easy for us (disadvantaged schools) to improve*.

Meanwhile, a superintendent contended that the Department of Education organises workshops for school principals as well as the school governing bodies to advise them on ways of raising funds and marketing their schools. This official asserts that schools need to take initiative and should not always rely on the Department. He explained: "*If the school is always waiting for the Department to do things for it that school cannot improve*".

An educator in school B felt a need for principals of disadvantaged schools to be creative. This educator maintained that disadvantaged schools should stop complaining about their position and network with principals of advantaged schools. According to this educator, this can help disadvantaged schools to move out of their present positions. Moreover, principals of disadvantaged schools need to utilise the expertise of other staff members. An educator in school D contended that most principals of disadvantaged schools do not involve all staff members in what is taking place in the school. Another educator said:

> *Yes. Principals need to realise that they cannot do everything on their own. Changes taking place in the country are sometimes confusing, therefore, principals should learn to bring everyone on board. In fact, what is happening in advantaged schools is that principals do not do everything but they (principals of advantaged schools) delegate work to staff members*.

This clearly shows that some principals of the disadvantaged schools still lack both leadership and management skills. For these principals to improve their schools they need to be equipped with these skills. Clearly, disadvantaged schools can hardly improve without external support.

Discussion

Disadvantaged schools need to be helped in order for them to move out of their present position. Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:41) are of the opinion that schools need to be learning organisations, organisations that are constantly and systematically reflecting on their own practices and making appropriate adjustments and changes as a result of new insights gained through that reflection. Disadvantaged schools can only be able to do that with the intervention from various stakeholders. However, England (2004:19-20) contends that interventions will continue to be problematic and achieve very little, unless there is a real need for an intervention and the needs are identified and prioritised. For instance, it is no good trying to improve a mathematics educator's knowledge and teaching skills, if he/she is teaching in a poorly managed school with no adequate buildings or resources. The primary need here is buildings and resources.

For disadvantaged schools to be helped, their needs and priorities should be identified and analysed. England (2004:20) is of the opinion that most of the instruments required to conduct needs analyses are already in place, namely whole-school evaluation and developmental appraisal for educators. But without the commitment of all stakeholders the intended goals will not be achieved and consequently, disadvantaged schools will remain in their present position.

5.15.6 The role of the principal of the disadvantaged school in whole-school evaluation

For whole-school evaluation to be successfully implemented, it is crucial that all stakeholders should know the role of the principal, particularly the principal of a disadvantaged school.

Almost all participants in this study regard the role of the principal of the disadvantaged school in whole-school evaluation not only as critical but also as difficult. These participants base their perceptions on the fact that the principal of a disadvantaged school has to ensure that resources are available at the school but at the same time disadvantaged schools struggle to obtain these resources. The principal of school B maintained that the principal of a disadvantaged school carries the entire burden and if the school fails all the blame goes to him/her. The principal of school A contended that disadvantaged schools because of their backgrounds struggle to cope with changes being introduced.

All educators interviewed in this study contend that the most important role that the principal of a disadvantaged school should play in whole-school evaluation is that of giving support to all staff members. Although an educator in school D contended that she was not quite sure of the role of the principal in whole-school evaluation, she maintained that the principal should ensure that everything is in place so that whole-school evaluation could be conducted smoothly. This educator said:

> *I think the principal, as a manager of the school should ensure that everything is in place before whole-school evaluation is done. What I am trying to say here is that the principal should ensure that we as the staff and those that are associated with the school know what is expected of us during and after the evaluation.*

But educators maintained that sometimes the Department makes the work of principals difficult. For example, an educator in school A blamed the Department of Education for non-payment of the school fees. According to this educator, the Department of Education misleads the parents by saying the Department funds schools. As a result most parents have decided not to pay the school fees. This educator explained:

> *Really, the Department makes the work of the principals difficult because they tell the parents that they (the Department of Education) are doing everything for the schools. As a result parents are reluctant to pay the school fees. At the same time there is very little that the Department is doing for the schools*.

An educator in school A quickly added: "*For example, we have just received books that we ordered last year. But this is the middle of the year. What is even worse is that the number of these books is far less than what we ordered*".

An educator in school B maintained that the principal of a disadvantaged school should also be a motivator. Conditions under which educators and other staff members work are not conducive for them to meet the demands and challenges brought about by the new changes. As a result the majority of staff members are discouraged. Therefore, the principal should always be there to motivate them. The principal of school B also confirmed this: "*Basically, my role is to motivate people (staff members) to get things done*". But this principal was quick to mention that the problem

in disadvantaged schools is that they always find it difficult to motivate the people because staff members have to share the limited resources that their schools have.

Meanwhile, the principal of school D maintained that because disadvantaged schools do not have means to implement changes that are being introduced, including whole-school evaluation principals of these schools should network with principals of advantaged schools and other disadvantaged schools. According to this principal, networking can help the principal of a disadvantaged school as he/she would get to know how other principals deal with challenges that they face. Likewise, a superintendent contended that the principal, especially the principal of a disadvantaged school should not only network but should also market his/her school. According to this official, this should be done on a regular basis.

Discussion

The single most critical factor for a good school is the school principal. It is rare that one will find a competent, organised and positive manager in a dysfunctional school (Rault-Smith, 2004:47). But the role of the principal of a disadvantaged school is complicated by the fact that the school has limited or does not have the resources at all to implement whatever changes being introduced.

Therefore, for whole-school evaluation to be conducted effectively, principals of disadvantaged schools need more support from various stakeholders. Without this support whole-school evaluation, as well as other initiatives of the Department of Education and/or the government will be hardly achieved in the disadvantaged schools. Sterling and Davidoff (2000:54) argue that a leader (principal) cannot struggle to focus on his/her roles when faced with so many problems that are outside of his or her control. According to Sterling and Davidoff (2000:54), the pressures of poverty and limited resources are real and the likelihood is that they will get worse. Therefore, principals of disadvantaged schools should look for assistance in order for them to be able to deal with such pressures.

Principals are responsible and also accountable for the implementation of the initiatives of the Department of Education and so they need the necessary skills to put these initiatives into practice. As Sterling and Davidoff (2000:54) put it, principals, (particularly principals of disadvantaged

schools) should not be victims of pressures imposed by changes taking place in the country (South Africa).

Conclusions on disadvantaged schools

For any policy/change to be successfully implemented, the context of each school should be taken into account. As Sharpley (2004:58) puts it, while there is one education system in South Africa, every school is different and is in a unique environment (cf 5.8). Effecting change at the school must take into account the impact that this intervention will have on the school's surroundings.

Many reforms introduced into the schools have been borrowed from other countries and have not been adequately contextualised for the South African situation. Schools have not been adequately prepared for the effective implementation of these reforms (Burton & Murugan, 2004:65). As a result disadvantaged schools, in particularly find it difficult to cope with these changes.

5.16 SUMMARY

This chapter has described schools in the research, characteristics of individual participants and the findings from the analysis of data. However, the characteristics of all the Department of Education officials, both the superintendents and the supervisors (external evaluators) were not included in the data and the reasons for not including them are stated in 5.1.

The data collected during observations and during the individual and focus group interviews are presented under the following themes: changes taking place in the South African education system, the managerial role of principals, the implementation of whole-school evaluation and disadvantaged schools.

The last chapter (chapter six) will conclude with a synthesis of significant themes, the implications for the managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation in the context of disadvantaged schools and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER 6

OVERVIEW OF INVESTIGATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter begins with a general overview of the investigation in order to show that the aims of the research expressed in 1.5 have been addressed and achieved.

The theory underlying whole-school evaluation, the managerial role of the principal, as well as an overview of educational provision in disadvantaged schools in general and in the South African context in particular has been given attention. The literature is integrated with the experiences of principals, educators and Department of Education officials (superintendents of Education Management and supervisors/external evaluators) concerning the managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation in the context of disadvantaged schools in KwaZulu-Natal. A synthesis of the main findings is also provided in this chapter.

Recommendations for improving the managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation, particularly in disadvantaged schools derived from the research are briefly set out. Possible areas for further research are also identified in this chapter. The chapter concludes with the identification of limitations of the study.

6.2 OVERVIEW OF THE INVESTIGATION

What exactly constitutes the managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation is very difficult to determine because there is no clear understanding of the various aspects of principals' work as part of current restructuring (cf 1.4. & 5.5.1). Scant attention has been given to the impact of the changes on principals who are expected to lead the implementation of school reform and restructuring (Evans in Portin et al, 1998:1). While it is widely acknowledged that the part which the school principal can play in managing the processes at the school is a crucial factor in ensuring its restructuring, research on the principalship has failed to keep pace with this changing context (cf 1.4). Changes taking place in education system in general and in South Africa in particular, however, demand that principals should perform their managerial role effectively for these changes

to be effectively implemented. Central to the success of the principal performing his/her managerial role in whole-school evaluation, particularly in disadvantaged schools, is that all stakeholders should not only understand the role played by principals but should also know how this role should be performed.

6.2.1 Whole-school evaluation : A theoretical basis

In order to determine how evaluation in general and whole-school evaluation, in particular is conducted or implemented, a literature study was undertaken. The emphasis throughout was on whole-school evaluation as it is implemented in schools and the responsibilities of the major role-players in its implementation with particular reference to South Africa.

This research indicates that there are different approaches to evaluation. But in South Africa the following approaches have been adopted: developmental appraisal system, whole-school evaluation and systemic evaluation (cf 2.4). Although different types of evaluation take different forms, their purpose is always to provide *improvement*. Without evaluation one cannot measure whether the institution is achieving its objectives or not. Thus, whole-school evaluation, systemic evaluation and developmental appraisal systems/approaches have been adopted in South Africa in order to create an environment where both the individual and the school could develop so that they should provide quality education (2.3). The literature reveals that the key areas for evaluation in whole-school evaluation around which quality will be assured are: basic functionality of the school; leadership, management and communication; governance and relationships; quality of teaching and learning and educator development; curriculum provision and resources; learner achievement; school safety, security and discipline; school infrastructure and parents and the community (cf 2.3.3: 2.3.3.1 to 2.3.3.9).

These areas constitute the major aspects of the school's work (cf 2.3.3). Therefore, to determine if the school is fulfilling its mandate these areas need to be evaluated and where necessary action taken in order to make improvement. The literature reveals that for these areas not only to be effectively evaluated but also for the improvement to be effective, all major role-players need to play their roles effectively. There is a chain of responsibility that runs from the National Ministry to individual schools (cf 2.6). For example, schools should conduct self-evaluation prior to the external evaluation (cf 2.4.2). The literature also reveals that whole-school evaluation in South

Africa is conducted according to guidelines and criteria set by the National Ministry of education (cf 2.4.2). Therefore, all role-players should familiarise themselves with these guidelines, criteria and instruments used in whole-school evaluation.

Whole-school evaluation is being implemented in schools operating under different circumstances. This has a bearing on the manner in which whole-school evaluation is implemented or should be implemented. The literature reveals that the context in which educational policies, including whole-school evaluation are being implemented, has a major influence on the implementation of those policies. This is evident in schools in the South African contexts where disadvantaged schools struggle to implement new policies; advantaged schools cope better as they have resources to implement them (cf 2.7).

6.2.2 The managerial role of the principal

In order to determine the role of the principal in whole-school evaluation, a literature study was undertaken. The emphasis throughout was on the managerial role of the principal, as it is perceived from both the local and international perspectives.

The literature reveals that changes taking place worldwide have put the role of the principal in the limelight (cf 3.1). As a result the principal is faced with a number of challenges and demands. For principals to overcome these challenges, they need to acquire new managerial and leadership skills (cf3.2). Therefore, the role of the school principal, particularly in implementing these new changes needs to be re-defined. One of the roles that the principal should play so that effective teaching and learning should take place is the managerial role (3.2).

The literature reveals that the managerial role of the principal includes: instructional management and support; providing leadership; facilitating meaningful change; supervision; evaluation; building and maintaining a winning team; developing human resources; staff appraisal; monitoring the implementation of educational policies; monitoring of learner progress; managing curriculum and instruction and promoting a positive school climate (cf 3.2.1 to 3.2.9). These roles, however, are not all inclusive and others can also be identified (cf 3.2). If the principal performs these roles and other important duties effectively and efficiently, quality education can be achieved in schools. The school principal should, however, always take the context of the school into account whenever

performing his/her roles. This context has a bearing not only on the principal's roles but also on the manner in which teaching and learning should take place.

The literature also indicates that the principal should link his/her managerial roles with whole-school evaluation so that the school can improve (cf 3.3). The manner in which some of the managerial roles of the principal can be linked to whole-school evaluation is discussed in Chapter 3 (cf 3.3). But the literature reveals that this is not always easy for most principals, as they lack the necessary training and skills (cf 3.2.11).

6.2.3 Disadvantaged schools/communities

Education policies are being implemented in South African schools which operate in different and unique conditions. These conditions, more often than not, determine the success or failure of schools in implementing these policies or reforms. For example, disadvantaged schools always struggle to implement some if not most of these new policies, whereas, advantaged schools have most of the needed resources to implement these new policies (2.7 & 6.2.1). Thus, both policy formulators and implementers must take the uniqueness of schools into account all the times.

The literature shows that disadvantaged schools in developing countries, including South Africa serve the majority group of the population, whereas in developed countries disadvantaged schools serve the minority group of the population (cf 3.4). This places a mammoth task to the governments of the developing countries, as they have to put the majority of the learners on the equal footing with previously advantaged learners. The literature reveals that in spite of the radical changes in the education system, there is still no effective schooling in most disadvantaged schools which happen to serve disadvantaged communities (cf 3.4). According to the literature, the following are some of the issues that affect the disadvantaged schools: lack of infrastructure; limited proficiency in the medium of instruction; overcrowding; discipline problems; criminal incidents; school dropouts; poverty and the effects of HIV/AIDS (cf 3.5.1 to 3.5.8). This implies that learners in disadvantaged schools are disadvantaged in a number of ways. For example, they come from poor families; families that are disadvantaged and they attend schools that are disadvantaged (cf 5.13.2). This has a negative bearing on their learning.

6.2.4 The research design

Chapters 2 and 3 provided a useful and necessary background to whole-school evaluation, the managerial role models and theories, as well as educational provision in disadvantaged schools/communities. However, these two chapters did not provide a detailed account of the managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation in the context of disadvantaged schools or communities. As few studies have been conducted on the topic, a qualitative approach (cf 1.8 & 4.2) was considered appropriate for an exploratory study of the managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation in the context of disadvantaged schools in KwaZulu-Natal.

Four schools (two primary and two secondary schools), a Circuit Office in KwaMashu (a black township outside Durban), as well as a Provincial Office in Durban were identified (cf 4.3.4 & 4.3.6). After gaining access, the researcher spent a period in each school as participant observer (cf 4.3.8.1). However, no period was spent at the Circuit Office, as well as a Provincial Office. In-depth individual interviews with four Department of Education officials (two superintendents of Education Management and two external evaluators/supervisors) were conducted (cf 4.3.8.2). In-depth individual interviews with principals of the four schools chosen were also conducted (cf 4.3.8.3). Focus group interviews with four groups of educators from the four schools were conducted (cf 4.3.8.4). In total 24 participants were included in the research.

The data collected were analysed according to procedures typical of qualitative research and organised according to emerging key themes (cf 4.3.10). These themes relate to changes taking place in the South African education system (cf 5.4); the managerial role of principals (cf 5.5); the implementation of whole-school evaluation in KwaZulu-Natal schools (cf 5.6) and whole-school evaluation and disadvantaged schools (cf 5.13). A further synthesis of the key themes was undertaken and main findings integrated with key findings discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 (cf 6.3).

6.3 SYNTHESIS OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section integrates prior research and theory reviewed in Chapters 2 and 3 with the significant themes uncovered in the qualitative investigation. The findings relate to the managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation in the context of disadvantaged schools in KwaZulu-Natal.

6.3.1 The impact of educational changes on the managerial role of the principal

Findings reveal that changes taking place in the education system have an influence on the roles performed by different individuals in the school environment (cf 5.5.3). For example, principals have to ensure that whole-school evaluation is effectively implemented at school. To do that effectively means that the principal needs to acquire new skills of performing his/her roles.

The research also reveals that because of changes taking place in the education system principals have to regularly attend meetings, workshops and departmental briefings. As a result they do not have enough time to attend to their duties in their schools. It also transpired in this study that because of the information overload principals are sometimes unable to provide guidance, direction and support to their staff members (cf 5.5.3).

Recommendations

Changes always imply that people should acquire new skills to be able to implement those changes. It is, therefore, important that all role-players should not only know what impact educational changes have on their roles but should also know what skills they need to deal with these changes.

Workshops to equip principals with proper managerial skills should be organised. It is important, however, that these workshops should be organised at convenient times so that principals should not leave schools during normal teaching hours. This will enable principals more time in their schools to support educators and other staff members, as principals are mostly needed during the times of change. Schools should also be centres for learning for all stakeholders. For example, schools should organise workshops for educators and parents to acquaint them with their new roles because of these changes. As a result schools should not only have ongoing developmental programmes for educators but they should also have programmes for parents as well. This can help them understand how the roles of the principal and their own roles have been affected by the changes taking place in the education system.

6.3.2 The implementation of whole-school evaluation in KwaZulu-Natal schools

Whole-school evaluation is being conducted in South African schools, including schools in KwaZulu-Natal Province (cf 5.6). But the investigation showed that whole-school evaluation is not effectively conducted in schools because of a number of factors. For example, the research reveals that in KwaZulu-Natal there is a shortage of supervisors as a result they are only able to evaluate small number of the schools selected by the National Department of Education for whole-school evaluation (cf 5.6). The research also reveals that not every principal and educator received training in whole-school evaluation. This affects the manner in which whole-school evaluation is being conducted or implemented in schools.

Recommendations

For whole-school evaluation to be conducted in all schools selected by the National Department of Education for that particular year, the Department must employ enough supervisors. For example, in KwaZulu-Natal supervisors maintained that the number of supervisors is *too limited* to cope with the numbers of schools given by the National Department of Education (cf 5.6). Therefore, the Department is not able to achieve its objectives.

The Department should also ensure that *all* stakeholders understand whole-school evaluation and its implications. For example, it is not acceptable that none of the principals who participated in this study attended a workshop or training in whole-school evaluation (cf 5.6.3). Principals who participated in this study maintained that they did not receive invitations for the training. It is, therefore, recommended that the Department (District Offices/Circuit Offices) should improve their means of communication. They should also have mechanisms in place for checking if schools receive correspondence. Principals unable to attend the meeting/workshop/training should inform the Department in advance and should also send a representative to that workshop/meeting/training. Valid reasons for not attending a workshop/training, preferably in writing, should be given to the Department (District/Circuit Office: whoever appropriate).

6.3.3 The attitude of schools towards whole-school evaluation

The success or failure of any activity depends on the attitude of the people who perform that activity. Therefore, for whole-school evaluation to succeed all people who are affected by it should have a positive attitude towards it.

Findings, however, show that schools have different attitudes towards whole-school evaluation, as well as the supervisors. Attitudes of schools towards whole-school evaluation and the supervisors influence the manner in which different schools implement it (cf 5.6.4). The study shows that lack of training on both principals and educators has a major impact on determining the attitudes of schools towards whole-school evaluation, as well as the supervisors. It also transpired in this study that the manner in which changes are being introduced in the context of South African schools creates uncertainties among the educators. The research reveals that too many changes have been introduced within a short space of time. As a result most schools struggle to understand these changes and end-up developing a negative attitude towards them.

Recommendations

People can only develop a positive attitude towards a policy/reform if they understand it well. They should know what the benefits of implementing that particular policy are. It is, therefore, recommended that effective workshops, briefings and trainings should be organised for all stakeholders before any policy/reform is implemented. Implementers, in particular should have a thorough understanding of that particular policy before they implement it. Knowing the pros and cons of whole-school evaluation will not only help schools (principals and educators) develop positive attitudes towards it but will also enable them to implement it effectively and efficiently.

Policy formulators, as well as Departmental officials should, however, bear in mind that developing a positive attitude of schools towards whatever change is a process which needs to be nurtured. Therefore, schools should be provided with the necessary support, especially during the times of uncertainties. Schools are more likely to develop a positive attitude not only towards whole-school evaluation but also towards other departmental initiatives if they know that the Department, particularly the District Office is supporting them.

It is also recommended that changes should be developed evolutionary. This will enable implementers to understand a change before another change/reform is being introduced. Too much information is confusing and may result in people getting demotivated which is an indication of a negative attitude towards that particular information. Meanwhile, people are likely to develop a positive attitude towards change if it takes place in an evolutionary way (Mazibuko, 2003:112).

6.3.4 Training offered in whole-school evaluation

The research reveals that the majority of the educators who participated in this study did not receive any training in whole-school evaluation. The only four educators who received training maintained that training that was offered was not extensive but it was just a crash course. As a result they did not benefit much from the workshop (cf 5.13.4).

It also reveals that none of the four principals who participated in this study received training in whole-school evaluation (cf 5.6.3). This implies that principals cannot effectively support their staff members to implement whole-school evaluation in their schools. Moreover, without training principals would not be able to know what is expected of them before, during and after whole-school evaluation is conducted.

The investigation shows that effective training in whole-school evaluation has not been provided to both principals and educators. This has a negative impact on the implementation of whole-school evaluation in schools.

Recommendations

For role players to perform their roles effectively, every role player should be adequately trained. It is, therefore, recommended that both principals and educators should be adequately trained in whole-school evaluation so that they can perform their roles effectively and efficiently. It is also recommended that people with expertise should offer such training.

It is, thus, recommended that the Department of Education should utilise the services of private providers. The Department should, however, form a partnership with reliable private providers. Therefore, the Department should check the credentials of the private providers before forming a

partnership. This will address the dissatisfactions of the educators that most of the times; training offered to them is effective. However, England (2004:21) warns that these providers should not intrude when and where they are not really needed. Instead, they and the Department of Education (Provincial/District/Circuit) need to commit themselves to real partnerships. The Department should also avoid the use of cascade model of training, as this model of training is not effective (Mazibuko, 2003:115).

It is also important that training and other workshops for both principals and educators do not interfere with teaching and learning. Therefore, these should take place after school hours, during weekends and/or during school holidays. School hours should always be utilised for teaching and learning activities.

6.3.5 The role of the major role-players in whole-school evaluation

The research illustrates that whole-school evaluation, like all other government initiatives can only succeed if all role-players understand their roles (tasks) and perform these roles effectively (cf 2.6). However, findings reveal that not all role-players understand their roles in whole-school evaluation. Findings also reveal that all role-players do not play their roles effectively as a result whole-school evaluation is failing to achieve the intended goals and objectives.

Although the emphasis of the study is on the role of the principal in whole-school evaluation, the research shows that the principal cannot be able to play his/her role effectively and efficiently without other role-players playing their roles. For example, findings show that whole-school evaluation is not properly conducted because District Offices are not supportive to the schools. Despite schools having submitted their school improvement plans, not much has been done to address the recommendations of the supervisors.

Recommendations

For whole-school evaluation to be successful, every role-player should perform his/her role effectively and efficiently. It is, therefore, recommended that the Department of Education should have proper mechanisms in place to monitor if all role-players perform their roles effectively. But role-players first need proper training for them to perform their roles as expected.

The Department of Education should ensure that everyone is made accountable. For example, schools and District Offices should submit monthly or quarterly reports on the progress made in terms of addressing the recommendations of the supervisors. Without accountability people will always neglect their responsibilities. Both the schools and the Department should move away from the '*blame frame'* and start working closely. They need to work together towards a common purpose. Where necessary the services of the other outside service providers should be sought in order to assist the role-players to be effective in their activities.

6.3.6 The role of the principal in whole-school evaluation

The research reveals the principal has a very crucial role to play in whole-school evaluation just like other departmental policies or initiatives (cf 5.6.6). Therefore, all stakeholders should know what roles principals should play in whole-school evaluation. The research also reveals that although all role players have an important role to play during whole-school evaluation, the school principal should be in the forefront and ensure that he/she supports them.

This study indicates that the principal has an important role to play in whole-school evaluation before, during and after whole-school evaluation has been completed in the school (cf 5.6.6). For example, the principal should inform the school (all role players) about the visit of the supervisors, as well as the role of each individual during the whole-school evaluation. But the study shows that because of lack of training principals do not perform their roles adequately (cf 5.13.4).

The research reveals that the following are some of the obstacles that make it difficult for some principals, particularly those of the disadvantaged schools to perform their role in whole-school evaluation effectively: lack of funds, lack of District Support, lack of training in whole-school evaluation for principals.

Recommendations

Without principals performing their roles adequately, whole-school evaluation will not succeed. It is, thus, crucial that principals should know what is exactly expected of them during whole-school evaluation. Therefore, the Department has to ensure that principals are supported so that they would

be able to understand their roles better. The study, however, reveals that this support is not forthcoming.

It is, therefore, recommended that mechanisms should be put in place to monitor that principals get the support they require. Departmental officials should be visible in schools to assist whenever assistance is required. For school to support educators and other stakeholders, principals also need support from the Department. Without this support principals may end-up performing their roles in a hit-or-miss fashion. This will result in whole-school evaluation and other reforms not being effectively implemented (cf 5.5.2).

The literature and findings reveal that the role of the principal in whole-school evaluation is not clearly stated. It is, therefore, recommended that the role that the principal plays or should play in whole-school evaluation should be clearly stated so that confusion can be eliminated.

6.3.6.1 The role of the principal in developing the school improvement plan

The role of the principal is crucial not only in developing the school improvement plan but also in ensuring that the recommendations of the supervisors are addressed. The research reveals that educators expect the principal to play a leading role in ensuring that the school improves. Therefore, the principal should put the necessary structures in place for drawing up the school improvement plan. For example, he/she should convene staff meetings to discuss the findings and recommendations of the supervisors.

It, however, transpired in this research that it is not always possible for all principals to develop proper school improvement plans and/or to address the recommendations of the supervisors. As a result they expect the Department to do everything.

Recommendations

For principals who have experienced difficulties in drawing up proper improvement plans, it is recommended that they should look for outside assistance. Principals should move out of their comfort zones, particularly that there are too many changes being introduced in South African

schools. Networking with other principals from advantaged and disadvantaged schools can minimise some of the problems experienced by disadvantaged school principals.

Although District Offices and Circuit Offices can play an important role in coordinating a link between advantaged schools with disadvantaged schools, the principal should not wait for the Department to do for his/her school. Principals should be able to market their schools. But they need marketing skills to do so.

It is also recommended that District officials should receive thorough training on whole-school evaluation so that they could be to support schools. Presently, schools maintained that they have not addressed the recommendations because the support from the District Office is not forthcoming.

6.3.6.2 The principal as a resource provider

The principal should provide the necessary resources so that there can be effective teaching and learning at school. However, the research reveals that principals of disadvantaged schools are unable to provide these resources. Most disadvantaged schools lack both teaching and learning materials (cf 5.9.1 & 5.10.4). As a result these schools struggle to implement the new changes, including whole-school evaluation.

The study reveals that although educators acknowledge that there are obstacles that make it difficult for disadvantaged school principals to provide resources, principals cannot abdicate that responsibility (cf 5.6.6).

Recommendations

Without the necessary resources, schools cannot provide quality education. Therefore, principals should be helped to acquire skills in raising funds to be able to purchase the required resources (5.15.5). The Department should organise more workshops for principals, as well as the members of the school governing bodies.

Disadvantaged schools should also make use of community leaders to approach companies for sponsorships. Companies employing parents of the learners attending these schools, including

supermarkets serving disadvantaged communities should be requested to adopt these disadvantaged schools. It is recommended that instead of these companies giving schools money they purchase the needed resources for these schools.

6.3.7 Problems encountered by schools during the whole-school evaluation

The research illustrated a number of problems encountered by schools during the whole-school evaluation. These problems have an impact on the manner in which whole-school evaluation is conducted in schools. The following problems were listed as some of the problems that are encountered when conducting whole-school evaluation in schools: lack of resources (cf 5.8.3.1); overcrowding (cf 5.8.3.2) and lack of support from the Department of Education (cf 5.8.3.3).

Recommendations

The implementation of any policy and the provision of education and training are dependent in the final analysis on the availability of resources (cf 3.3). Without the necessary resources no proper teaching and learning can take place. What compounds the problem is that the community of KwaMashu also lacks resources. As a result the community is also unable to provide these resources to schools. For example, there is only one municipal library in the community (cf 5.2.1).

It is, therefore, recommended that school principals should acquire skills on fundraising in order to generate funds to purchase the needed resources. However, resources need to be managed. Therefore, principals, as well as staff members should have the necessary skills to maintained and manage the resources. Schools together with community leaders should approach the private sector for donations. The best option is to use the parents of the learners to gain access to the places of their employment. It is also recommended that schools should organise school functions, like prize giving days where they would invite people holding high positions in big companies as guest speakers in these functions. This can enable these companies to see and understand the conditions under which disadvantaged schools work. Principals should, therefore, acquire marketing skills.

Overcrowding is one of the major problems facing almost all disadvantaged schools. This problem can be addressed by building more schools in the disadvantaged communities. The Department should also make funds available for the addition of more classrooms in schools that have the

problem of overcrowding. For effective teaching and learning to take place the learner-educator ratio should be reduced to 1:28. This, however, means that more educators should be hired.

The other problem mentioned is the lack of support from the Department of Education (District Office). Without this support whole-school evaluation is doomed to fail. It is, therefore, recommended that the National and Provincial Departments of Education should firstly train the District officials so that they fully understand their duties in terms of ensuring that whole-school evaluation is effectively conducted. The National and Provincial Departments of Education should also ensure that they have mechanisms in place to monitor if District Offices ensure that schools implement policies/changes initiated by the Department. District Offices should be made accountable (6.3.6).

6.3.8 The results of whole-school evaluation in KwaMashu schools

Results are always important because they give an indication whether the goals/objectives of an organisation are being achieved or not. Findings of this research show that results of whole-school evaluation (both internal and external evaluations) vary from school to school. But, generally, supervisors maintained that the results of whole-school evaluation in KwaMashu schools were acceptable (cf 5.9).

Findings reveal that the results of each school were influenced by factors within and outside that particular school. As a result they differ from school to school. But findings show no significant difference in the results of these schools obtained during the self-evaluation and those obtained during the external evaluation. The other factor that contributed to the results of these schools was that none of the principals of these schools had received training in whole-school evaluation (cf 5.6.3 & 5.12.1.4).

Recommendations

Schools cannot have proper and reliable results without the principals, educators and other staff members having undergone intensive training in whole-school evaluation. Therefore, the point of departure is to offer adequate training to all staff members so that they should understand the pros and cons of whole-school evaluation.

It is recommended that all staff members should have a clear understanding of what is to be evaluated, how it is evaluated and why it is evaluated (cf 3.2.6). All stakeholders should have common understanding of evaluation and its results. Results alone are not enough; stakeholders should also know what to do with these results and what are the implications of those results to them as individuals and/or as groups.

School principals and staff members should have a clear understanding as to how to go about when conducting school self-evaluation. Therefore, schools should have proper structures in place that will ensure that whole-school evaluation is conducted fairly and equitably. Once these structures have been put in place, they need to understand the key principles of whole-school evaluation; key areas that are evaluated and criteria that are being used. As Potterton (2004:71) suggests, supervisors also need the right image, they need to have better communication with schools about the process and procedures.

Supervisors also need intensive training in order to be able to earn the respect of schools from different backgrounds. For example, one of the supervisors maintained that former Model C schools would even go to the extent of trying to check the credentials of the supervisors (5.6.4). Surely, if these schools know that all supervisors have undergone extensive training, they would accept them without any reservations.

6.3.9 Problems encountered in addressing the findings and recommendations of the external evaluators (supervisors)

The research reveals that in all schools that participated in this study the findings and recommendations of the supervisors have not been addressed. According to the schools that participated in the study, whole-school evaluation was conducted in their schools two to three years ago and the recommendations of the supervisors were submitted to the District Office. But nothing has happened in terms of addressing the recommendations of the supervisors (cf 5.6).

It, therefore, seems as if there is something wrong with the implementation of whole-school evaluation in certain areas in KwaZulu-Natal. Findings show that the following are some of the barriers to implementation of recommendations made by the supervisors: lack of funds (cf

5.12.1.1); lack of District support (cf 5.12.1.2); the unclear role of the Circuit Offices (cf 5.12.1.3) and lack of training for principals in whole-school evaluation (cf 5.12.1.4).

Recommendations

It is, really, unacceptable that the recommendations of the supervisors have not been addressed after whole-school evaluation was conducted two to three years ago. This shows that there is something wrong with both the schools and the Department of Education. This confirms what some participants said that the Department of Education has no monitoring systems or has ineffective monitoring systems in place to determine whether the findings and recommendations of the external evaluators are being addressed. (cf 5.12.1.1). Really, this thing needs to be addressed immediately.

Schools complain about the lack of funds to enable them to address areas that need their attention. Schools need to be really committed if they are serious about their own improvement. Principals, in particular should go out and ask for help from outside. For example, principals need to network with principals of advantaged schools and this will pave the way for their staff members to network as well. Principals claim that they are unable to network but if they are really serious they need to persevere. The Department of Education must also make more funds available, particularly to disadvantaged schools in order to assist these schools to implement new policies.

With regard to District support, more supervision is needed to ensure that District Offices do their work properly. The Provincial and National Departments of Education need to be very firm on these District Offices. They need to train District officials (cf 6.3.6 & 6.3.7) and/or to hire people with expertise. Otherwise, the Department of Education will not be able to assist schools to improve.

The other important issue is the role played by the Circuit Offices in whole-school evaluation. This role needs to be clearly stated to avoid confusion that presently exists. Circuit Offices should not just act as bridges between schools and District Offices; they need to play an active role in whole-school evaluation. Circuit Offices are close to schools and they deal with these schools regularly. As a result they can play an important role in the implementation of whole-school evaluation. Presently, it appears as if Circuit Offices are sidelined as far as whole-school evaluation is concerned.

Training for principals, particularly for disadvantaged principals should be compulsory. The Department should also ensure that *all* principals receive adequate training on whole-school evaluation so that they could be able to implement it effectively (cf 6.3.4).

6.3.10 The impact of educational changes on disadvantaged schools

The research reveals that disadvantaged schools struggle to implement not only whole-school evaluation but also other Departmental initiatives. It also reveals that disadvantaged schools are not only found in rural areas but also in townships (cf 5.13.2).

Findings also show that although most of the educational changes aim at helping disadvantaged schools to move out of their present position, these changes have a negative impact on these schools. It transpired in the research that most disadvantaged schools find it difficult to cope with these changes (cf 5.13.3). As a result these policies are not achieving their intended goals/objectives.

Recommendations

For disadvantaged schools to be helped concerted effort is needed. All people with interest in education should be brought on board for the benefit of the disadvantaged schools. The problem is that most if not all disadvantaged schools serve disadvantaged communities. Therefore, whatever attempt is made to help disadvantaged schools effort should also be made to ensure that the surrounding context is also taken into account.

Disadvantaged schools need an urgent intervention so that these changes could be beneficial not only to them but also to the communities as well. According to England (2004:17), interventions are necessary in schools in poor communities because disadvantaged schools: are poorly resourced for effective teaching and learning; have limited and/or problematic parental and *community* involvement and support; are faced with numerous problems, such as learner discipline, crime, drugs, child abuse, poverty, hunger, alcoholism, AIDS, unemployment and political power struggles. The Department of Education with its limited capacity cannot cope with the challenges. However, England (2004:20) warns that the Department of Education should seek interventions of

the service providers after it has conducted evaluations, skills audits and appraisals in conjunction with those service providers.

To ensure that assistance offered to schools is meaningful, there should be strategies in place for monitoring whatever projects are being undertaken. It is recommended that the Department of Education should not introduce too many reforms within a short space of time. Disadvantaged schools because of their background should be given enough time to understand a reform before another reform is introduced. Without this, educational changes being introduced in South Africa will continue benefiting advantaged schools. It is also important that policy formulators should understand the needs of the disadvantaged schools and then formulate policies that would address those needs, instead of speculating. Success happens when it is needs based and linked to performance (Rault-Smith, 2004:46). This suggests that research should be conducted to find out the real needs of schools, particularly disadvantaged schools, instead of deciding what is good for schools.

6.3.11 The role of the disadvantaged school principal in whole-school evaluation

The role of the principal is always critical for the success of whatever reform is being introduced. But findings show that the principal of a disadvantaged school always struggle to implement changes because of the conditions under which he/she works. Findings reveal that the implementation of whole-school evaluation in disadvantaged schools is problematic because, among the other things, principals do not have the support of all stakeholders (cf 5.13.4). These principals also do not understand their roles in whole-school evaluation well.

Recommendations

The role of the principal, particularly the principal of a disadvantaged school in whole-school evaluation should be clearly stated. The principal of a disadvantaged school should know what is actually expected of him/her as far as the implementation of whole-school evaluation is concerned. The Department must not put too much pressure on these principals and they must be given time since change is a process not an event.

It is very important that guidelines should be provided specifying what roles should the principal play before, during and after whole-school evaluation has been conducted in the school. The Department should ensure that all principals understand their roles before whole-school evaluation is conducted. There should also be monitoring mechanisms in place not only to determine whether principals, particularly those from disadvantaged schools perform their roles but also to ensure that these principals are provided with the immediate support whenever they need it.

Without the support of all stakeholders, particularly that of the Department principals of disadvantaged schools will hardly execute their duties in whole-school evaluation as required. As Rault-Smith (2004:46) suggests, the push-pull approach should be adopted. This means putting some pressure on the school community so that they realise that they need to take advantage of opportunities to assist them to change and at the same time to give support they need to change.

6.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The findings of this study on the managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation in the context of disadvantaged schools suggest the following priority areas in the search for further knowledge.

From a methodological perspective, it is recommended that the use of a qualitative research methodology should be further explored, as it allows participants the opportunity to discuss issues that they consider to be important from their own frame of reference (cf 4.2.3.6). This methodology is considered appropriate because it looks at the *meanings* that participants attach to their own natural settings (cf 4.2.3.7). It is, therefore, recommended that a qualitative methodology be used in a situation where the aim of a study is to determine the perceptions of the participants. A qualitative methodology is also appropriate for the discovery of important areas or themes because it allows participants the opportunity to define the topics and questions to be pursued in larger projects.

Because whole-school evaluation is a new concept, particularly in the South African context, and there is a lack of research on the managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation, this research attempted to investigate the role that principals play in the implementation of whole-school evaluation, particularly in disadvantaged schools. However, many aspects relating to the managerial

role of the principal in whole-school evaluation within disadvantaged schools still require more detailed research, such as the following:

- Strategies to help principals of disadvantaged schools improve their managerial skills.
- The attitude of schools towards educational changes with reference to whole-school evaluation.
- The impact of educational policies on disadvantaged schools.
- Problems encountered by disadvantaged schools in the implementation of whole-school evaluation.
- The role of the principal in implementing the recommendations of the external evaluators (supervisors).
- The attitude of the departmental officials towards the whole-school evaluation.
- The support offered to school after the process of whole-school evaluation is completed.

6.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The primary goal of this research is to determine the managerial role that the principal plays in whole-school evaluation, particularly in disadvantaged schools from the perspective of Department of Education officials, principals and educators. This study, however, demonstrates both the strengths and the limitations of such an investigation.

The small size of the sample, typical of qualitative research (cf 4.2.3.2), is the most obvious limitation of the study. It cannot support a general theory on the managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation in the context of disadvantaged schools. Obviously, different schools would have disclosed different findings. This research was designed to be exploratory in nature. Therefore, it was concerned with generalisation or prediction.

This research was purposefully limited to schools chosen on the basis of accessibility. The participants and schools were also chosen on the basis of their willingness to take part in the research. This, therefore, implies that different results might be obtained in different circumstances, for example, if schools that were reluctant to participate were included in the research. The primary goal of the study was to understand the managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation from the perspective of the participants within the context of disadvantaged schools. As a result no

attempts are made to generalise or quantify the findings. Data were presented in descriptive form only.

The overview of the existing literature (Chapters 2 & 3) provided a valuable background to the interviews, suggesting that individual interviews with the Department of Education officials (cf 4.3.8.2) and principals (cf 4.3.8.3), as well as focus group interviews with educators (cf 4.8.3.4) were suitable data collection strategies in this study. Possible factors that could have influenced the research were included in the statement of subjectivity. Following data analysis, findings were presented according to themes emerged from the participants' accounts.

In spite of these limitations, the rich data, characteristics of qualitative methodology (cf 4.2.3.1 to 4.2.3.9), yielded information which may be used for a larger and more rigorous study. Moreover, data gathered from this study yielded key areas (cf 5.2, 5.3 & 5.4) that contributed to a better understanding of the managerial role of the principal in the context of disadvantaged schools. These key areas also indicated aspects in which further research can be done (cf 6.4).

6.6 SUMMARY

Whole-school evaluation is being conducted in South African schools. But the research reveals that whole-school evaluation is not properly done in schools because the major role-players are not performing their roles effectively. Principals of disadvantaged schools appear to be uncertain of their managerial role in whole-school evaluation and some principals and educators did not receive training on whole-school evaluation. This also affects the manner in which whole-school evaluation is being done in most schools.

Moreover, schools allege that they get no support from the Department of Education, particularly the District Office. As a result both the schools and the District Offices have not addressed the recommendations of the supervisors in most areas. This is the result of the fact that the Department of Education has no proper mechanisms to monitor the implementation of its policies. This suggests that schools, particularly disadvantaged schools, will not improve as areas for improvement identified by the supervisors are not being addressed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aitken, J.E. 1996. Addressing barriers to learning. Unpublished document.

African National Congress. 1995. *A policy framework for education and training*. Manzini: McMillan.

Armstrong, S. & Armstrong, S. 1996. The conductor as a transformational leader. *Music Educators Journal*, 82 (6): 22-25.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C. & Razavich, A. 1990. *Introduction to research in education*. (4th edition). Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C. & Razavich, A. 2002. *Introduction to research in education*. (6th edition). Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.

Badat, S. 1997. Educational politics in the transition period. In Kallaway, P., Kruss, G., Fataar, A. & Donn, G. *Education after apartheid*: *South African education in transition*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Badenhorst, D.C. 1997. School management. In Lemmer, E.M. & Badenhorst, D.C. *Introduction to education for South African teachers*: *an orientation to teaching practice*. Kenwyn, Cape Town: Juta.

Bailey, G.D. & Dyck, N. 1990. The administrator and co-operative learning: roles and responsibilities in leadership. *Clearing House*, 64 (1): 1-7.

Baily, V., Bemrose, G., Goddard, S., Impey, R., Joslyn, E. & Mackness, J. 1995. *Essential research skills*. Hammersmith, London: Harper Collins.

Barberton, C., Blake, M. & Kotzé, H. 1998. *Creating action space*: *the challenge of poverty and democracy in South Africa*. IDASA, Cape Town: David Philip.

Basson, C.J.J., Van der Westhuizen, P.C. & Niemann, G.S. 1991. Organisational theory. In Van der Westhuizen, P.C. (ed) *Effective educational management*. Pretoria: HAUM.

Beresford, B. 2001. AIDS takes an economic and social toll: impact on households and economic growth most severe in Southern Africa. *Africa Recovery*, 15 (1-2): 19-27.

Berg, B.L. 2004. *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. (5th edition). Boston: Pearson.

Bergh, A.P. & Van Wyk, J.N. 1997. Interpreting qualitative research findings. Unpublished paper presented at Research Seminar for M. Ed and D. Ed students. May/October 1997. UNISA: Institute for Education Research, Faculty of Education.

Best, J.W. & Kahn, J.V. 1993. *Research in education*. (7th edition). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bissetty, K. 1998. School heads slam lenient policies: let's get tough! *Daily News*. 23 October 1998.

Black, S. 1998. A different kind of leader. *American School Board Journal*, 185 (6): 32-35.

Blairs, D. 1992. The primary school principal: administrative manager or instructional leader? *The Practising Administrator*, 14 (2): 30-34.

Blandford, S. 2000. *Managing professional development in schools*. Routledge, London: Taylor & Francis Group.

Blandford, J. 2003. Targets, assessment for learning, and whole-school improvement. *Cambridge Journal of Education*. 33 (2): 257-271.

Bless, C. & Higson-Smith, C. 1995. *Fundamentals of social research methods*: *an African perspective*. (2nd edition). Kenwyn, Cape Town: Juta.

Bogdan, R.C. & Biklen, S.K. 1992. *Qualitative research for education: an introduction to theory and methods*. (2nd edition). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bodgan, R.C. & Biklen, S.K. 2003. *Qualitative research for education*: *an introduction to theory and methods*. (4th edition). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Botha, R.J. & Hite, S.J. 2000. Outcomes-based education and quality: cursory remarks about a possible relationship. *Educare*. 29 (1 & 2): 60-75.

Boyd, B. 1996. The principal as teacher: a model for instructional leadership. *NAAP Bulletin*, 80: 65-73.

Bradshaw, L.K. & Buckner, K.G. 1994. Changing times, changing schools. *National Association for School Principals Bulletin*, 78 (559): 78-83.

Burns, B. 1996. *Managing change: a strategic approach to organisational dynamics*. (2nd edition). London: Pitman.

Burns, N. & Grove, S.K. 2003. *Understanding nursing research*. (3rd edition). Philadelphia: Saunders.

Burton, M. & Murugan, P. 2004. Transformation in education: some observations and experiences from All Saints, King Williams Town. In Du Plooy, P. & Westraad, S. *From policy to practice*: *whole-school development & whole-school evaluation*: *2003 forum proceedings*. Port Elizabeth: Delta Foundation.

Carpenter, D.R. 2003. Ethical considerations in qualitative research. In Streubert Speziale, H.J. & Carpenter, D.R. *Qualitative research in nursing*: *advancing the humanistic imperative*. (3rd edition). Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Carpenter, D.R., & Jenks, J.M. 2003. Triangulation as a qualitative research strategy. In Streubert Speziale, H.J. & Carpenter, D.R. *Qualitative research in nursing*: *advancing the humanistic imperative*. (3rd edition). Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Charles, C.M. 1999. *Building classroom discipline*. New York: Longman.

Chisholm, L. 2000. *A South African curriculum for the twenty first century*: *report of the review committee on Curriculum 2005*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Chrispeels, J. 1996. Effective schools and home~school~community partnership roles: a framework for parent involvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 7 (4): 297-323.

Christie, P. 1997. Globalisation and the curriculum: proposals for the integration of education and training. In Kallaway, P., Kruss, G., Fataar, A. & Donn, G. *Education after apartheid*: *South African education in transition*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Christie, P. 1999. OBE and unfolding policy trajectories: lesson to be learned. In Jansen, J.D. & Christie, P. (eds). *Changing curriculum*: *studies on outcomes-based education in South Africa*. Kenwyn, Cape Town: Juta.

Christine, J. 2004. Discipline the real problem in schools. *The Mercury*. 16 September 2004. Durban.

Claassen, J.C. 1998. Global issues and the South African teacher. In Pretorius, F. & Lemmer, E.M. *South African education and training*: *transition in a democratic era*. Randburg: Hodder & Stoughton.

Claassen, J.C. 1999. The nature and scope of education policy studies. Unpublished Study Guide 1 for MEDEM1-Q. Pretoria: UNISA.

Clayton, S. 1996. *Sharpen your team's skills in supervision*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Coburn, H. 1998. Consumer information: should Ireland have school league tables? *Ireland Farmers Journal*. 2: 1-3.

Coutts, A. 1995. Human rights education in a culturally diverse school class. In Coutts, A. *Empower the teacher*. Southern, Halfway House: International Thomson Publishing.

Creswell, J.W. 2003. *Research design*: *qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, London: Sage.

Cullingford, C. 1997. Assessment, evaluation and the effective school. In Cullingford, C. *Assessment versus evaluation*. London: Cassell

Cunningham, W.C.C. 2000. *Educational administration*: *a problem-based approach.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Dagley, D.L. & Orso, J.K. 1991. Integration summative, formative modes of evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin*, 71 (497): 1-10.

Dalin, P. & Rust, V.D. 1996. *Towards schooling for the twenty-first century*. London: Cassell.

Darling-Hammond, L. 1990. Instructional policy into practice: the power of the top over the bottom. *Educational Evaluation and Analysis*, 12 (3) 233-341.

Davidoff, S. & Lazarus, S. 1997. *The learning school*: *an organisational development approach*. Kenwyn, Cape Town: Juta.

Davidoff, S. & Lazarus, S. 2002. *The learning school*: *an organisational development approach*. (2nd edition). Lansdowne, Cape Town: Juta.

Davies, B. 1997. Introduction. In Davies, B. & Ellison, L. *School leadership in a 21st century*: *a competency and knowledge approach*. London: Routledge.

Davies, B. & Ellison, L. 1995. Improving the quality of schools – ask the clients? *School Organisation*, 15 (1): 5-12.

Dean, J. 1995. Leadership and management. In Dean, J. *Managing the primary school*. (2nd edition). New York: Routledge.

De Clercq, F. 1997a. Policy intervention and power shifts: an evaluation of South Africa's education restructuring policies. *Journal of Education Policy*, 12 (3): 127-146.

De Clercq. F. 1997b. Effective policies and the reform process: an evaluation of South African's new development and education macro policies. In Kallaway, P., Kruss, G., Fataar, A. & Donn, G. *Education after apartheid*: *South African education in transition*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. 2000. Introduction: the discipline and practice of qualitative research. In Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (eds). *Handbook of qualitative research*. (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Department of Education. 1996. Changing management to manage change in education. *Report of the Task Team on Education Management Development*. Unpublished.

Department of Education. 1997. Quality education for all : overcoming barriers to learning and development. *Report of the National Commission on Special Needs in Education and Training (NCSNET) and National Committee on Education Support Services (NCESS)*. Pretoria: National Department of Education.

Department of Education. 2000a. *Whole-school evaluation*: *evaluation guidelines and criteria*. July 2000. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Department of Education. 2000b. *The South African model for whole-school evaluation*. http://education.p.w.v.gov.za /DoE_sites_African_model_for_whole_sch.html. Accessed on 16 July 2003.

Department of Education. 2000c. *Instruments for school evaluation and school self-evaluation*. September 2000. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Department of Education. 2001a. *Report on the school register of needs 2000 survey*. Pretoria: National Department of Education.

Department of Education. 2001b. *Handbook*: *an introduction to whole-school evaluation policy*. February 2001. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Department of Education. 2001c. Systemic evaluation project grade 3 level: report on the colloquium on systemic evaluation. Kopanong Conference Centre, 23-25 April 2001. Discussion document. Unpublished report.

Department of Education. 2001d. *Evaluation guidelines and criteria for the whole-school evaluation policy*. December 2001. Pretoria: National Department of Education.

Department of Education. 2005. *Pandor*: *release of 2005 senior certificate examination results*. http://www.polity.org.za/pol/speech/2005/?show=79211.

Dimmock, C. & O' Donoghue, T.A. 1997. *Innovative school principals and restructuring: life history portraits of successful managers of change*. London: Routledge.

Donald, D., Lazarus, S. & Lolwana, P. 2004. *Educational psychology in social context*. (2nd edition). Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Donmoyer, R. & Wagstaff, J.G. 1990. Principal can be effective managers and instructional leaders. *NAAP Bulletin*, 74 (525): 20-29.

Drake, T.L. & Roe, W.H. 1999. *The principalship*. (5th edition). Merrill, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Dreyer, J. 2000. *Curriculum 2005*. Tutorial letter 301/2000 for EDUFAC-N. Pretoria: UNISA.

Du Four, R. & Berkey, T. 1995. The principal and staff developer. *Journal of Staff Development*, 16 (4): 2-6.

Earley, P. 1998. Conclusion: towards self-assessment? In Earley, P. *School improvement after inspection*? *School and LEA responses*. Paul Chapman, London: Sage.

Education Labour Relation Council. 2003. Integrated Quality Management System: collective agreement number 8 of 2003. Unpublished document.

Eisner, E.W. 1994. *The educational imagination*: *on the design and evaluation of school programmes*. (3rd edition). New York: MacMillan.

England, V. 2004. Interventions: do they really achieve what they set out to achieve? In Du Plooy, P. & Westraad, S. *From policy to practice*: *whole-school development & whole-school evaluation*: *2003 forum proceedings*. Port Elizabeth: Delta Foundation.

Erasmus, M. & Van der Westhuizen, P.C. 1996. Organisation development and the quality of working life in schools. In Van der Westhuizen, P.C. (ed). *Schools as organisations*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.

European Commission. 2001. Self-evaluation in Ireland. Effective school self-evaluation (ESSE) project. SICI. September 2001. Unpublished report.

Everard, K.B. & Morris, G. 1996. *Effective school management*. (3rd edition). London: Paul Chapman.

Fataar, A. 1997. Access to schooling in a post-apartheid South Africa: linking concepts to contexts. In Kallaway, P., Kruss, G., Fataar, A. & Donn, G. *Education after apartheid*: *South African education in transition*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Fidler, B. & Davies, J. 1998. The inspector calls again: the reinspection of schools. In Earley, P. *School improvement after inspection*? *School and LEA responses*. Paul Chapman, London: Sage.

Fontana, A. & Frey, J.H. 2000. Interview: from structured questions to negotiated text. In Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (eds). *Handbook of qualitative research*. (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Frase, L.E. & Melton, R.G. 1992. Manager or participatory leader? What does it take? *NASSP Bulletin*. 17-24.

Fullan, M. 1993. The complexity of the change process. In Fullan, M. *Change forces probing the depths of educational reform*. London: The Farmer Press.

Fullan, M. & Miles, M. 1999. Getting school reform right. In Gulting, J., Ndhlovu, T. & Bertram, C. Creating people-centred schools: school organisation and change in South Africa. *Reader*. Cape Town: SAIDE & Oxford University.

Garrett, V. 1997. Managing change. In Davies, B. & Ellison, L. *School leadership in a 21st century*: *a competency and knowledge approach*. London: Routledge.

Glasman, N.S., & Heck, R.H. 1992. The changing leadership role of the principal: implications for principal assessment. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 68: 5-24.

Glesne, C. & Peshkin, A. 1992. *Becoming qualitative researchers*: *and introduction*. New York: Longman.

Greene, M. 1988. Qualitative research and the uses of literature. In Sherman, R.R. & Webb, R.B. (eds). *Qualitative research in education*: *focus and methods*. London: Falmer Press.

Griffiths, B. Acting General Manager, Office of Review Education Victoria Australia. 1998. Improving school efficiency: student and school evaluation. Unpublished document. School efficiency Seminar, December 1998.

Grober, B., Campher, T., Du Preez, P., Loock, C. & Shaba S.M. 2002. Effective education management series: Management of the school in context. *Module 2*. Sandown: Heinemann.

Gronn, P. 1996. From transactions to transformations: a new world in the study of leadership? *Educational Management & Administration*, 24 (1): 7-30.

Halle, T.G., Kurtz-Costes & Mahoney, J.L. 1997. Family influences on school achievement in low-income, African American children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89 (3): 527-537.

Hallinger, P., Bickman, L. & Davies, K. 1996. School context, principal leadership and learner reading achievement. *The Elementary School Journal*. 96 (5): 527-549.

Hanson, E.M. 1996. *Educational administration and organisational behaviour*. 4th edition. Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.

Harber, C. 1999. Education and theories of development. In Lemmer, E. (ed.) *Contemporary education*: *global issues & trends*. Sandton: Heinemann.

Hargreaves, A. & Fullan, M.G. 1992. *Understanding teacher development*. Columbia University, New York: Teachers College Press.

Hawley, W.D., Rosenholtz, S.J., Goodstein, J. & Hasselbring, T. 1984. School leadership and student learning. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 61 (4): 53-83.

Heneveld, W. 1994. *Planning and monitoring the quality of primary education in Sub-Saharan Africa*. AFTHR. Technical note No. 14. Technical Department Africa Region, The World Bank: Washington DC.

Hillman, J. 1996. Introduction: The challenge of disadvantage. In National Commission on Education. *Success against the odds*: *effective schools in disadvantaged areas*. London: Routledge.

Hoberg, S.M. 1993. Organisational commitment: implications for the leadership role of the school principal. *Educare*, 22 (1 &2): 64-69.

Hoberg, S.M. 1994. Effective educational management: comparative observations on the interconnectedness between principals and educators. *Educare*, 23 (2): 43-47.

Hoberg, S.M. 1999. Research methodology. Unpublished Study Guide 2 for MEDEM2-R. Pretoria: UNISA.

Hollin, C.R. 1993. Social reasons for bad behaviour. In Varma, V.P. (eds). *Management of behaviour in schools*. London: Longman.

Hopkins, D., Jackson, D., West, M & Terrell, I. 1997. Trinkets for the natives or cultural change? In Cullingford, C. *Assessment versus evaluation*. London: Cassell.

Horine, J.E., Hailey, W.A. & Rubach, L. 1993. Transforming schools. *Quality Progress*, 26 (10): 31-33.

Hoy, W.H. & Miskel, C.G. 1991. *Educational administration*: *theory research and practice*. New York: Random House.

Hoy, W.H. & Miskel, C.G. 1996. *Educational administration*: *theory, research and practice*. (5th edition). New York: McGraw Hill.

Hoy, W.H. & Miskel, C.G. 2001. *Educational administration*: *theory, research and practice*. (6th edition). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Human Rights Watch. 2001. *Scared at school*: *sexual violence against girls in South African schools*. New York. Unpublished report.

Jansen, J.D. 1995. Effective schools? *Comparative Education*, 31 (2): 181-199.

Jansen, J.D. 2001. School autonomy and evaluation on the politics of performance in South African education: autonomy, accountability and assessment. *Prospects*. XXXI (4): 553-564.

Janson, C.A. 1996. The organisational culture of the school. In Van der Westhuizen, P.C. *Schools as organisations*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Jantjes, E. 1995. The influence of the home environment and parental support on school achievement. *Perspectives in Education*, 16 (2): 289-304.

Jantjes, E.M. 1996. Performance based teacher appraisal: appraisal from judgement to development. *South African Journal for Education*. 16 (1): 50-57.

Jarvis, B., Meek, A. & Shepherd, M. 1995. The socio-political context of education in South Africa. In Coutts, A. *Empower the teacher*. Southern, Halfway House: International Thomson Publishing.

Johnson, B. & Christensen, L. 2004. *Educational research*: *quantitative, qualitative and mixed approaches*. (2nd edition). Boston: Pearson.

Jones, J. 1993. *Appraisal and staff development in schools*. London: David Fulton Publishers.

Khattri, N., Riley, K.W. & Kane, M.B. 1997. Students at risk in poor, rural areas: a review of the research. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*. 13 (2): 79-100.

Kilfeather, F. 2000. Quality of education. *National Parents Council – Primary*. Irish Times. March 2000.

Killen, R. 1999. Outcomes-based education: some issues to consider in the South African context. Unpublished paper presented at Vista University and M. L. Sultan Technikon during May – June 1998 as part of the AUSAID funded Australian – South African Institutional Links Project. No – 2 – 007.

Krueger, R.A. 1994. *Focus group*: *a practical guide for applied research*. (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Krug, S.E. 1992. Instructional leadership: a constructivist perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28 (3): 430-443.

Kruger, A.G. 2003a. Cultivating a culture of learning and teaching. In Van Deventer, I. & Kruger, A.G. *An educator's guide to school management skills*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Kruger, A.G. 2003b. Efficient financial management. In Van Deventer, I. & Kruger, A.G. *An educator's guide to school management skills*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Kruger, A.G. 2003c. Managing the instructional programme. In Van Deventer, I. & Kruger, A.G. *An educator's guide to school management skills*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Kruger, A.G. & Van Schalkwyk O.J., 1997. *Classroom management*. Pretoria: Van Schaik

Kruger, A.G. & Van Zyl, A.E. 2000. Instructional leadership: managing the school as an organisation. Unpublished tutorial letter 000/2000 for MEDEM5-U. Pretoria: UNISA.

KwaZulu-Natal Department of Education. 2003. IQMS. Collective agreement number 8 of 2003. Unpublished report.

Lacey, K. 1996. *Performance appraisal and career planning*: *the complete 'how to' guide for teachers and schools*. South Melbourne: MacMillan.

Lankshear, C. & Knobel, M. 2004. *A handbook for teacher research*: *from design to implementation*. Open University Press, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Law, S. & Glover, D. 2000. *Educational leadership and learning*: *practice, policy and research*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

LeCompte, M.D. & Goetz, J.D. 1982. Problems of reliability and validity in ethnographic research. *Research of Educational Research*, 52 (1): 31-60.

LeCompte, M.D. & Preissle, J. 1993. *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. (2nd edition). San Diego, California: Academic Press.

Leedy, P.D. 1993. *Practical research*: *planning and design*. (5th edition). New York: McMillan.

Leedy, P.D. & Ormrod, J.E. 2005. *Practical research*: *planning and design*. (8th edition). Saddle River, New York: Prentice-Hall.

Lemmer, E.M. 1992. Qualitative research methods in education. *South African Journal of Education*, 12 (3): 292-295.

Lemmer, E.M. 1995. Selected linguistic realities in South African schools: problems and prospects. *Educare*. 24 (2): 82-96.

Lemmer, E.M. 1998a. Managing quality in education. In Pretorius, F. (eds). *Outcomes-based education in South Africa*. Randburg: Hodder & Stoughton.

Lemmer, E.M. 1998b. The teacher and the learner. In Pretorius, F. & Lemmer, E.M. *South African education and training*: *transition in a democratic era*. Randburg: Hodder & Stoughton.

Lemmer, E.M. 2000. The Epstein model of family-school partnerships: teachers' experiences in South African schools. *Educare,* 29 (1 & 2): 60-75.

Lemmer, E. & Squelch, J. 1993. *Multicultural education*: *a teachers' manual*. Pretoria: Southern.

Le Roux, C. 2000. Off to a flying start: the intricacies of chapter one. In Moll, A. (ed.) Unpublished papers presented at research seminar for M. Ed students. Pretoria, UNISA.

Lewenson, S.B. 2003. Historical research method. In Streubert Speziale, H.J. & Carpenter, D.R. *Qualitative research in nursing*: *advancing the humanistic imperative*. (3rd edition). Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Lonsdale, P. & Parsons, C. 1998. Inspection and the school improvement hoax. In Earley, P. *School improvement after inspection*? *School and LEA responses*. Paul Chapman, London: Sage.

Lytle, J.H. 2002. Whole-school reform from the inside. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 164-167.

Lund, R. 1996. *A whole-school behaviour policy*: *a practical guide*. London: Kogan Page Limited.

Maeroff, G.I. 1998. Schools as community agencies help needy kids. *Education Digest,* 64 (3): 1-10.

Malcolm, C. 2001. Implementation of outcomes-based approaches to education in Australia and South Africa: a comparative study. In Jansen, J.D. & Sayed, Y. (eds). *Implementing education policies*: *the South African experience*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G.B. 1999. *Designing qualitative research*. (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Mayo, R.W. 1997. Trends in teacher evaluation. *The Clearing House*, 70: 269-270.

Mazibuko, S.P. 2003. *The role of the school principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education in KwaMashu schools*. M.Ed. dissertation. Pretoria: UNISA.

McMillan, J.H. & Schumacher, S. 2001. *Research in education*: *a conceptual introduction*. (5th edition). New York: Longman.

McNamara, G., O'Hara, J. & Ni Aingléis, B. 2002. Whole-school evaluation and development planning. *Educational Management & Administration*. 30 (2): 201-211.

Mda, T. 1998. The teacher and support services. In Pretorius, F. & Lemmer, E.M. *South African education and training*: *transition in a democratic era*. Randburg: Hodder & Stoughton.

Mead, S. 2005. Schooling's crumbling infrastructure: addressing a serious and underappreciated problem. *Education Week*. 1-3. http://www.ppionline.org/ndol/print.cfm?contentid=253404. Accessed on 22 October 2005.

Mertens, D.M. 2005. *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: integrated diversity with quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods*. (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Mhlongo, A. 2006. Unions applaud increase in teacher posts. *Daily News*. 28 July 2006. Durban.

Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. 1994. *Qualitative data analysis*: *an expanded sourcebook*. (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Miller-Lachmann, L. & Taylor, L.S. 1995. *Schools for all*: *educating children in a diverse society*. Albany: Delmar.

Ministry of Education. 2003. *School improvement planning*. Guyana: Virtual Library. htt://www.sdnp.org.gy/minedu/teacher/sip2.htm. Accessed on 22 August 2003.

Møller, C. 1995. Home environment and educational achievement among high-school pupils living in three-generation urban black households. *South African Journal of Sociology*, 26 (3): 87-97.

Moloi, K.C. 2002. *The school as a learning organisation*: *reconceptualising school practices in South Africa*. Hatfield, Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Monare, M. 2006. Testing the teachers: agreed system of evaluating performance not done. *Daily News*. 7 February 2006. Durban.

Morris, J. 2005. Cycle of hunger can be broken. *Sunday Tribune*. 16 October 2005.

Mouton, J. 1996. *Understanding social research*. Pretoria: Academic.

Mosoge, M.J. & Van der Westhuizen, P.C. 1998. School-based management: Implications for the new roles of principals and teachers. *Koers*, 63 (1 & 2): 73-87.

Mothata, S. (ed). 2000. *A dictionary of South African education and training*. Johannesburg: Hodder & Stoughton.

Mpumalanga Department of Education. s.a. *Grade 6 systemic evaluation*: *Mpumalanga province*. http://www.hsrc.ac.za/research/output/outputDocument/3576_Grade6Mpumalanga.pdf. Accessed on 19 March 2006.

Muijs, D, Harris, A, Chapman, C., Stoll, L. & Russ, J. 2004. Improving schools in socio-economically disadvantaged areas – a review of research evidence. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 15 (2): 149-175.

Murgatroyd, S. 1991 Strategy, structure and quality service: developing school wide quality improvement. *School Organisation*, 11 (1): 7-19.

Murphy, J. & Hallinger, P. 1992. The principalship in the era of transformation. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 30 (3): 77-88.

Naicker, S. & Waddy, C. 2002. Towards effective school management: quality assurance and the developmental appraisal system. *Manual 3*. Maskew Miller Longman.

Naicker, S. & Waddy, C. 2003a. Towards effective school management: managing the curriculum. *Manual 10*. Maskew Miller Longman.

Naicker, S. & Waddy, C. 2003b. Towards effective school management: discipline, safety and security. *Manual 12*. Maskew Miller Longman.

Natriello, G., McDill, E.L. & Pallas, A.M. 1990. *Schooling disadvantaged children*. Colombia University, New York: Teachers College Press.

Neuman, W.L. 2000. *Social research methods*: *qualitative and quantitative approaches*. (4th edition). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Nevo, D. 1994. Combining internal and external evaluation: a case for school-based evaluation. *Studies in Education Evaluation*. 20: 87-98.

Nevo, D. 1995. *School-based education*: *a dialogue for school improvement*. Oxford: Pergaman.

Ngcongo, R.G.D. 1995. *Educational leadership*: *an African perspective*. Pietermarizburg: Reach Out.

Nias, J., Southworth, G. and Campbell, P. 1992. *Whole school curriculum development in the primary school*. London: Farmer Press.

Nongogo, S. 2004. District Office support and how other outside agencies can assist in the transformation process. In Du Plooy, P. & Westraad, S. *From policy to practice*: *whole-school development & whole-school evaluation*: *2003 forum proceedings*. Port Elizabeth: Delta Foundation

Oldroyd, D., Elsner, D. & Poster, C. 1996. *Educational management today*: *a concise dictionary and guide*. London: Paul Chapman.

Oliphant, V. & Tyatya, D. 2004. Whole-school evaluation in the Department of Education: a local perspective. In Du Plooy, P. & Westraad, S. *From policy to practice*: *whole-school development & whole-school evaluation*: *2003 forum proceedings*. Port Elizabeth: Delta Foundation.

Oliva, P.F., & Pawlas, G.E. 2001. *Supervision for today's schools*. (2nd edition). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Ormston, M. & Shaw, M. 1993. *Inspection*: *a preparation guide for schools*. Harlow: Longman.

Parker, S.A. & Day, V.P. 1997. Promoting inclusion through instructional leadership: the roles of the secondary school principals. *Bulletin*, 83-89.

Patel, F. 2001. Whole-school evaluation and developmental appraisal. *SADTU National education policy conference*. http://www.sadtu.org.za/press/speeches/2001/25-4-2001.0.htm. Accessed 22 on August 2003.

Patton, M.Q. 1990. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. (2nd edition). Newbury, London: Sage.

Patton, M.Q. 2002. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Peters, F. 2004. An approach to whole school development. . In Du Plooy, P. & Westraad, S. *From policy to practice*: *whole-school development & whole-school evaluation*: *2003 forum proceedings*. Port Elizabeth: Delta Foundation.

Porter, A.W. & Lemon, D.K. 1988. How teachers perceive a principal's power. *National Association of Elementary School Principals*, 67 (3): 30-32.

Portin, B.S., Shen, J. & Williams, R.C. 1998. The changing principalship and its impact: voices from principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 1-8.

Potter, D. & Powell, G. 1992. *Managing a better school*. Heinemann, Halley Court: Jordan Hill.

Potterton, M. 2004. School improvement and the role of whole-school evaluation. In Du Plooy, P. & Westraad, S. *From policy to practice*: *whole-school development & whole-school evaluation*: *2003 forum proceedings*. Port Elizabeth: Delta Foundation.

Prain, V. & Hand, B. 2003. Using new technology for learning: a case study of a whole-school approach. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 35 (4): 441-450.

Pretorius, F. 1998. Managing change in an outcomes-based approach. In Pretorius, F. *Outcomes-based education in South Africa*. Randburg: Hodder & Stoughton.

Pretorius, F. 1999. Partnerships in education. In Lemmer, E. (ed.) *Contemporary education: global issues & trends*. Sandton: Heinemann.

Prinsloo, E. 2002. Challenges to the provision of schooling in South Africa. In Van Wyk, N. and Lemmer, E.M. (eds.) *Transforming education*: *the South African experience*. Hauppauge, New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Prinsloo, E. 2005. Socio-economic barriers to learning in contemporary society. In Langsberg, E., Krüger, D. & Nel, N. *Addressing barriers to learning*: *a South African perspective*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Prinsloo, I.J. 2003. Ensuring an effective staff. In Van Deventer, I. & Kruger, A.G. *An educator's guide to school management skills*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Puri, S.C 1996. *Stepping up to ISO 14000*: *integrating environmental quality with ISO 9000 and TQM*. Portland, Oregon: Productivity Press.

Quinlan, O. & Davidoff, S. 1997. *Valuing teachers through appraisal*. Pretoria: Via Africa.

Rault-Smith, J. 2004. The pivotal role of the school principal in school involvement. In Du Plooy, P. & Westraad, S. *From policy to practice*: *whole-school development & whole-school evaluation*: *2003 forum proceedings.* Port Elizabeth: Delta Foundation.

Relic, P. s.a. Self-evaluation for school improvement. President of NAIS. Unpublished document.

Republic of South Africa (RSA). 1996a. *South African schools act, 1996*. Act No 84 of 1996. Government Gazette, 377 (17579) 15 November 1996. Cape Town: Government Printer.

Republic of South Africa (RSA). 1996b. *National education policy act*, 1996. Act No 27 of 1996. 370 (17118) 24 April 1996. Cape Town: Government Printer.

Republic of South Africa (RSA). 2001. *The National policy on whole-school evaluation*. Government Gazette, 433 (22512). 26 July 2001. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Robbins, S.P. & De Cenzo, D.A. 2004. *Supervision today*. (4th edition). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Root, D. & Overly, D. 1990. Successful teacher evaluation – key elements for success. *NASSP Bulletin*. 35-38.

Rubin, A. & Babbie, E. 1997. *Research methods for social research*. (3rd edition). Pacific Grove, California: Brooks/ Cole Publishing.

Sack, J.L. 2002. Experts debate effects of whole-school reform. *ProQuest Education Journals*. 21 (20): 6.

SADTU. 2002. SADTU calls for urgent moratorium on whole-school evaluation (WSE). Media release issued by SADTU, NEC. 17 May, http://www.sadtu.org.za/press/2001/17-5-2002.0.htm. Accessed on 27 May 2002.

Samuel, J. 1990. *The state of education in South Africa*. In Nasson, B. & Samuel, J. Education: from poverty to liberty. Cape Town: David Philip.

Schurink, W.J., Shrurink, E.M. & Poggenpoel, M. 1998. Focus group interviewing and audio-visual methodology in qualitative research. In De Vos, A.S. *Research at grassroots*: *a primer for the caring professions*. J.L. van Schaik, Pretoria: Academic.

Schwabe, C.A. Illing, B. & Wilson, D.C. 1996. *Service need and provision within KwaZulu-Natal*. Pretoria: HSRC Publishers.

Schlebusch, G. & Thobedi, M. 2004. Outcomes-based education in the English second language classroom in South Africa. *The Qualitative Report*. 9 (1): 35-48.

Seekings, J. 2002. Indicators of performance in South Africa's public school system. *Centre for Social Science Research*, http:/www.eldis.org/static/DOC11177.htm.

Sergiovanni, T.J. 1992. Why we should seek substitute for leadership. *Educational leadership*. 41-45.

Sergiovanni, T.J. & Starratt, R.J. 1988. *Supervision*: *human perspectives*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sergiovanni, T.J. & Starratt, R.J. 1993. *Supervision*: *a redefinition*. (5th edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sharpley, G. 2004. Rural education in the Eastern Cape. In Du Plooy, P. & Westraad, S. *From policy to practice*: *whole-school development & whole-school evaluation*: *2003 forum proceedings*. Port Elizabeth: Delta Foundation.

Sheppard, B. 1996. Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*. XIII (4): 325-344.

Shimahara, N. 1988. Anthroethnography: a methodological consideration. In Sherman, R.R. & Webb, R.B. (eds). *Qualitative research in education*: *focus and methods*. London: Falmer Press.

Smith, W.F., Sparks, C.S. & Thurlow, M. 2001. *Appointing principals*: *what to look for, how to find it.* CSAEMP: McGill University.

Squelch, J.M. 1999. Governance in education. In Lemmer, E.M. (ed.) *Contemporary education*: *global issues & trends*. Sandton: Heinemann.

Squelch, J.M. & Lemmer E.M. 1994. *Eight keys to effective school management in South Africa*. Southern: Halfway House.

Statistics South Africa. 2003. *Census 2001*: *census in brief*. Pretoria: Stats S.A.

Sterling, L. & Davidoff, S. 2000. *The courage to lead*: *a whole school development approach*. Kenwyn, Cape Town: Juta.

Steyn, G.M. 2002a. The changing principalship in South African schools. *Educare*, 31 (1 &2): 251-272.

Steyn, G.M. 2002b. Professional development. In Steyn, G.M. & Van Niekerk, E.J. *Human resource management in education*. Pretoria: UNISA.

Steyn, G.M. & Van Niekerk, E.J. 2002. *Human resource management in education*. Pretoria: UNISA.

Stoll, L. 1999. Realising our potential: understanding and developing capacity for lasting improvement. *School Effectiveness and School improvement*. 10 (4): 503-532.

Stoll, L. & Fink, D. 1996. *Changing your schools*: *linking effectiveness and school improvement*. Buckingham: Open University.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. 1990. *Basics of qualitative research*: *grounded theory, procedures and techniques*. London: Sage.

Streubert Speziale, H.J. 2003. Designing data generation and management strategies. In Streubert Speziale, H.J. & Carpenter, D.R. *Qualitative research in nursing*: *advancing the humanistic imperative*. (3rd edition). Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Streubert Speziale, H.J. 2003. The conduct of qualitative research; common essential elements. In Streubert Speziale, H.J. & Carpenter, D.R. *Qualitative research in nursing*: *advancing the humanistic imperative*. (3rd edition). Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Swanepoel, B, Erasmus, B., Van Wyk, M. & Schenk, H. 2000. *South African human resource management*: *theory and practice*. (2nd edition). Kenwyn, Cape Town: Juta.

Taylor, S.J. & Bodgan, R. 1998. *Introduction to qualitative research methods*: *the search for meanings*. (3rd edition). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Taylor, S, Rizvi, F, Lingard, G, & Henry, M. 1997. *Education policies and the politics of change*. London: Routledge.

Terry, P.M. 1999. Essential skills for principals. *Thrust for Educational Leadership*, 29 (1): 28-32.

Thody, A. 1998. Training school principals, educating school governors. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 12 (5): 1-10.

Triandis, H.C. 1994. *Culture and social behaviour*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tuckman, B.W. 1994. *Conducting educational research*. (4th edition). Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.

Vakalisa, N.C.G. 2000. Inaugural lecture: curriculum, teachers and teaching: where does the answer for educational reform lie? *Educare*, 29 (1&2): 13-27.

Vally, S. & Spreen, C. 1998. Implementation of Curriculum 2005. *Quarterly Review of Education and Training in South Africa*, 5 (3): 13-26.

Van Dalen, D.B. 1979. *Understanding educational research*: *an introduction*. (4th edition). New York: Mc Graw-Hill.

Vandenberghe, R. 1992. The changing role of principals in primary and secondary schools in Belgium. *Journal of Educational Administration*. 30 (3): 20-34.

Vandenberghe, R. 1995. Creative management of a school: a matter of vision and daily interventions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 33 (2): 1-15.

Van der Horst, H. & McDonald, R. 1997. *OBE*: *Outcomes-based education*: *a teacher's manual*. Pretoria: Kagiso.

Van der Horst, H. & McDonald, R. 2003. *OBE*: *Outcomes-based education*: *theory and practice*. Irene: Tee Vee Printers.

Van der Westhuizen, P.C. 1991. Educational management tasks. In Van der Westhuizen, P.C. *Effective educational management*. Pretoria: HAUM.

Van Dyk, A. 2001. *HIV/AIDS care & counseling*: *a multidisciplinary approach*. (2nd edition). Cape Town: Pearson Education.

Van Heerden, E. 1997. Cultural diversity and schooling. In Lemmer, E.M. & Badenhorst, D.C. (eds.) *Introduction to education for South African teachers*: *an orientation to teaching practice*. Kenwyn, Cape Town: Juta.

Van Niekerk, P. 1999. Values and ideologies. In Lemmer, E. (ed.) C*ontemporary education: global issues & trends*. Sandton: Heinemann.

Van Wyk, J.N. 1996. Parent involvement in Black urban community in Gauteng. D. Ed. thesis. Pretoria: UNISA.

Van Wyk, J.N. 1999a. Policy analysis in education. Unpublished Study Guide 1 for MEDEM1-Q. Pretoria: UNISA.

Van Wyk, J.N. & Lemmer, E.M. 2006. Barriers to parent involvement in rural schools in the North West Province. *Journal of Educational Studies*, in press for 2006.

Van Wyk, J.N. & Mothata, M.S. 1998. Development in South African education since 1994. In Pretorius, F. (ed). *Outcomes-based education in South Africa*. Randburg: Hodder and Stoughton.

Van Wyk, N. 1999b. Schooling. In Lemmer, E. *Contemporary education*: *global issues & trends*. Sandton: Heinemann.

Van Wyk, N. 2002. School governance in South Africa. In Van Wyk, N. & Lemmer, E.M. *Transforming education*: *the South African experience*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Vulliamy, G., Lewin, K., Stephens, D.1990. *Doing educational research in developing countries*: *qualitative strategies*. London: Falmer.

Walker, A. 1990. Supervision for school and individual benefits. *The Practising Administrator*, 12 (4): 12-14.

Walker, E. 2003. Whole school reform and preschool education: the role of preschool education in policy decisions regarding the improvement of disadvantaged school systems. *Journal of Children & Poverty*, 9 (1): 71-88.

Webb. N. 1997. *Systemic evaluation*: *what we are learning and what we need to know*. National Institute for Science Education. 25 February, http://www.teech.terc.edu/papers/webb.htm. Accessed on 19 March 2006.

Weller, L.D. & Weller, S. 2000. *Quality human resources leadership*: *a principal's handbook*. Lanham: The Scarecrow Press.

Westraad, S. 2004. Introduction. In Du Plooy, P. & Westraad, S. *From policy to practice*: *whole-school development & whole-school evaluation*: *2003 forum proceedings*. Port Elizabeth: Delta Foundation.

Wierma, W. 1991. *Research methods in education*: *an introduction*. (5th edition). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Whitaker, B. 1997. Instructional leadership and principal visibility, *Clearing House*, 70 (3): 1-4.

Wiles, J. & Bondi, J. 2000. *Supervision*: *a guide to practice.* (5th edition). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Merrill.

Wilkinson, D. & Birmingham, P. 2003. *Using research instruments*: *a guide for researchers*. Routledge Falmer, London: Taylor & Francis Group.

Wolcott, H.F. 1990. On seeking and rejecting validity in qualitative research. In Eisner, F.W. and Peshkin, A. *Qualitative inquiry in education*: *the continuing debate*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Wolcott, H.F. 1995. *The art of fieldwork*. Walnut Creek, California: Alta Mira.

Woods, P. 1992. Symbolic interactionism: theory and method. In LeCompte, M.D., Millroy, W.L. & Preissle J. *The handbook of qualitative research in education.* San Diego, California: Academic Press.

Wright, D. 1993. Psychodynamic thinking and discipline. In Varma, V.P. (eds). *Management of behaviour in schools*. London: Longman.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

STATEMENT OF CONSENT

I am currently registered at the University of South Africa (UNISA) for the Doctor of Education degree (Education Management). In order to fulfill the requirements for this degree, I am required to undertake a small research project. The title of my proposed research project is *The managerial role of the principal in whole-school evaluation in the context of disadvantaged schools in KwaZulu-Natal*.

This research project requires that I interview the principal, a few educators in the selected schools and two Department of Education officials. These interviews will take the form of an unstructured discussion and will be tape recorded in order to save time and to ensure that I do not miss certain things during the conversation. Although verbatim use will be made of comments recorded during the discussion, neither the name of the school, nor the identity of the participants will be disclosed at any time. The identity of the school, the principal, educators and the Department of Education officials will be protected. The analysis of the data will be included in the thesis and may be used in the future in articles published in professional and scientific journals.

If you are willing to participate in this interview, within specified confines and safeguards, please sign below to indicate your consent.

(a) School/Circuit : _____

(b) Interviewee : _____

(c) Signature : _____

(d) Date : _____

APPENDIX B

GENERAL INFORMATION : PRINCIPAL

A. PERSONAL INFORMATION

(a) Name :
(b) Pseudonym :
(c) Age :
(d) Gender :
(e) Qualification :
(f) Years of experience as educator :
(g) Years of experience as principal :

B. INFORMATION ON SCHOOL

(a) Name of school :
(b) Number of learners :
(c) Number of educators :
(d) Number of classrooms :
(e) Number of staff rooms :
(f) Number of administrative staff members :

C. TRAINING FOR PRINCIPALS

(a) General training for principalship :
(b) Training course/s on leadership and management :
(c) Who offered the training?
(d) Training course for whole-school evaluation :
(e) Number of courses for whole-school evaluation :
(f) Duration of the training :
(g) Who offered the training?

APPENDIX C

GENERAL INFORMATION : EDUCATOR

A. PERSONAL INFORMATION

(a) Name :
(b) Pseudonym :
(c) Age :
(d) Gender :
(e) Qualification :
(f) Years of experience as educator :
(g) Grade taught :

B. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

(a) Training course/s attended :
(b) Training course/s on whole-school evaluation :
(c) Who offered these courses?
(d) How are these courses offered?
(e) Development programmes available at your school :
(f) Who offers these programmes?
(g) How are these programmes conducted?

APPENDIX D

GENERAL INFORMATION : SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION MANAGEMENT

A. PERSONAL INFORMATION

(a) Name :
(b) Pseudonym :
(c) Age :
(d) Gender :
(e) Qualification :
(f) Years of experience as superintendent of education management :

B. TRAINING COURSES

(a) Number of training courses for principals per annum :
(b) Number of training for principals on leadership and management :
(c) Who offered the training?
(d) Years of experience as whole-school evaluation co-ordinator :
(e) Number of training courses for principals on whole-school evaluation :
(f) Who offers training courses for principals on whole-school evaluation?
(g) Number of training courses for educators on whole-school evaluation :
(h) Who offers training for educators on whole-school evaluation?

APPENDIX E

GENERAL INFORMATION : EXTERNAL EVALUATORS (SUPERVISORS)

A. PERSONAL INFORMATION

(a) Name :
(b) Pseudonym :
(c) Age :
(d) Gender :
(e) Qualification :
(f) Years of experience as an external evaluator (supervisor) :

B. TRAINING COURSES

(a) Number of training courses for external evaluators (supervisors) per annum :
(b) Who offered the trainings?
(c) Number of training courses for principals on whole-school evaluation :
(d) Who offers training courses for principals on whole-school evaluation?
(e) Number of training courses for educators on whole-school evaluation :
(f) Who offers training for educators on whole-school evaluation?

APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW GUIDE : PRINCIPALS

This guide was used only to ensure that important issues are included in the discussion. At no time was the interview guide used to dictate the course of the discussion and all participants were allowed to raise issues that were of concern to them.

A. EDUCATIONAL CHANGES

- Generally, there are a number of educational changes taking place in the country, how beneficial do you think these changes are?
- How do these changes affect you as a principal?
- How do you communicate these changes to the community, particularly the parents?

B. MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP

- What do you regard as your main responsibilities /duties as the school principal?
- What do you understand by the concept *managerial role*?
- What do you regard as your managerial role/s as the school principal?
- In your opinion, how has the introduction of educational changes in the education system affected your managerial role?

C. WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION

- In your opinion, what is the general purpose of evaluation?
- What do you understand by the concept *whole-school evaluation*?
- What training were you as principal offered on whole-school evaluation?
- In your opinion, what is your role in whole-school evaluation?
- What do you regard as the role of educators in whole-school evaluation?
- What do you regard as the role of parents in whole-school evaluation?
- How does the developmental appraisal system link with whole-school evaluation?
- What is the purpose of integrated quality management system (IQMS)?

- How was whole-school evaluation done at your school?
- What challenges did you experience when doing whole-school evaluation?
- What areas in this school are considered to be very strong?
- What areas are considered weak?
- Considering the weaknesses, what are you planning to do to address these?
- What were the results of the internal (school self-evaluation) evaluation in your school?
- What improvement strategies did you put in place to address areas that you felt the school is not doing well?
- How are you going to ensure that the educators and parents will support you in addressing these areas?
- What were the results of the external evaluation?
- How did your own evaluation coincide with that done by the department?
- Were there areas in which you differed? Please explain.
- What strategies do you have in place for implementing the recommendations of the external evaluators?
- What assistance do you need from the department?
- What assistance have you been given?
- With hindsight, what have you learnt from the whole-school evaluation?

D. DISADVANTAGED SCHOOL

- How would you describe the community that the school serves, advantaged or disadvantaged? Why?
- How can you describe a *disadvantaged school*?
- Do you regard your school as a disadvantaged school? Why?
- In your opinion, how do the educational changes taking place impact on a disadvantaged school?
- How does the managerial role of the principal of a disadvantaged school differ from the managerial role of the principal of an advantaged school?
- What steps could the principal take to ensure that the school does not remain a disadvantaged school?

E. CONCLUDING REMARKS

- If you were to make suggestions about what is presently taking place in the education system, what suggestions would you make?
- Given the fact that there are many changes taking place in the education system, how do you see your future as a school principal?

APPENDIX G

INTERVIEW GUIDE : EDUCATORS

This guide was used only to ensure that important issues are included in the discussion. At no time was the interview guide used to dictate the course of the discussion and all participants were allowed to raise issues that were of concern to them.

A. EDUCATIONAL CHANGES

- What is your feeling about the educational changes that are taking place in the country?
- How does the principal ensure that you not only understand but also cope with these changes?
- How are education policies communicated to you?

B. MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP

- What do you regard as the main responsibilities/duties of the school principal?
- What do you understand by the concept *managerial role*?

C. WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION

- In your opinion, what is the general purpose of evaluation?
- What do you understand by the concept *whole-school evaluation*?
- What is the difference between the developmental appraisal system and whole-school evaluation?
- In your opinion, what is the role of the principal in whole-school evaluation?
- How was whole-school evaluation done in your school?
- What challenges did you experience when doing whole-school evaluation?
- What role did you play in whole-school evaluation (both internal and external evaluations)?
- How else could you have been used in whole-school evaluation?
- What problems did you experience when you implemented whole-school evaluation?
- How did the principal support you to overcome those problems?
- What were the results of the evaluation?

- What did you do with these results?
- How did the principal support you to address areas that need improvement?
- How does the department support you to address those areas?
- What further assistance do you need from the department?
- What have you learnt from the whole-school evaluation?

D. DISADVANTAGED SCHOOL

- How would you describe the community that the school serves, advantaged or disadvantaged? Why?
- How can you describe a *disadvantaged school*?
- Do you regard this school as a disadvantaged school? Why?
- In your opinion, how do the educational changes taking place impact on a disadvantaged school?
- How do you think the managerial role of the principal of a disadvantaged school differs from the managerial role of the principal of an advantaged school?

E. CONCLUDING REMARKS

- What comments would you like to share with me?
- Given the fact that there are many changes taking place in the education system, how do you see your future as an educator?

APPENDIX H

INTERVIEW GUIDE : SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION MANAGEMENT

This guide was used only to ensure that important issues are included in the discussion. At no time was the interview guide used to dictate the course of the discussion and all participants were allowed to raise issues that were of concern to them.

A. EDUCATIONAL CHANGES

- Generally, there are a number of educational changes taking place in the country, how does the Department of Education ensure that principals are kept abreast with these changes?
- How do you feel about the changes that are passed on to the principals?
- How do you communicate these changes to both the school principals and the educators?
- In your opinion, how do principals feel about these changes?

B. EDUCATIONAL POLICIES

- How do you ensure that school policies do not conflict with the policies of the Department of Education?
- How do you communicate the policies of the Department of Education to the schools?
- How do you ensure that these policies are effectively implemented at school level?
- What problems and/or concerns are being raised by the principals/schools regarding the new educational policies?
- How do you help principals/schools cope with these problems/concerns?

C. MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP

- What do you regard as the main responsibilities/duties of the school principal?
- What do you understand by the concept *managerial role*?
- In your opinion, how has the introduction of educational changes in the education system affected the managerial role/s of the principal?

D. WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION

- In your opinion, what is the general purpose of evaluation?
- What do you understand by the concept *whole-school evaluation*?
- What is your role as a whole-school evaluation co-ordinator?
- How does developmental appraisal system link with whole-school evaluation?
- What training programmes are available to support principals not only understand but also cope with whole-school evaluation as a new concept?
- How does the Department of Education support the whole-school evaluation process in schools?
- How does the Department of Education support schools in addressing areas which they believe need improvement?
- Why it is necessary that the school should develop a school improvement plan and a school development plan?
- What strategies do you have in place to assist schools implement the recommendations of the external evaluators?

E. DISADVANTAGED SCHOOL

- How would you distinguish between advantaged and disadvantaged communities?
- Why do you regard certain schools as disadvantaged schools?
- What impact do the educational changes have on the disadvantaged schools?
- How does the Department of Education help disadvantaged schools to move out of their present position?
- How does the Department of Education involve the NGOs in moving disadvantaged schools out of their present position?
- How do you think the managerial role of the principal of a disadvantaged school differs from the managerial role of the principal of an advantaged school?

F. CONCLUDING REMARKS

- What comments would you like to share with me?

APPENDIX I

INTERVIEW GUIDE : EXTERNAL EVALUATORS (SUPERVISORS)

This guide was used only to ensure that important issues are included in the discussion. At no time was the interview guide used to dictate the course of the discussion and all participants were allowed to raise issues that were of concern to them.

A. WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION

- In your opinion, what is the general purpose of evaluation?
- What do you understand by the concept *whole-school evaluation*?
- How does the developmental appraisal system link with whole-school evaluation?
- What is your role as an external evaluator in whole-school evaluation?
- What is the role of the team leader?
- What is the normal attitude of the schools towards you as supervisors and/or whole-school evaluation in general?
- How is whole-school evaluation conducted in schools?
- What do you normally find in schools when conducting whole-school evaluation?
- What is the role of the principal in whole-school evaluation?
- What is the role of educators in whole-school evaluation?
- What is the role of the parents in whole-school evaluation?
- How does the Department of Education assist schools after you have submitted your findings?
- In your opinion: why should schools have school development or school improvement plans?

B. DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS

- How would you distinguish between advantaged and disadvantaged communities?
- Why do you regard certain schools as disadvantaged schools?
- What impact do the educational changes have on the disadvantaged schools?
- How do you think the managerial role of the principal of a disadvantaged school differs from the managerial role of the principal of an advantaged school?

G. CONCLUDING REMARKS

- What other comments would you like to share with me?

APPENDIX J

INTERVIEW BETWEEN S. P. MAZIBUKO (RESEARCHER) AND EDUCATORS FROM SCHOOL D

Pseudonyms have been used to protect the identity of educators.

Researcher I would like to find out from you, what is your feeling about educational changes that are taking place in South Africa?

Sizwe Well, changes are good but the problem is that there are too many. The other thing is that after a particular change has been introduced there is no one to monitor whether that particular change is being implemented or not. And they do not check if that change is really helpful or is just a change that is meant to change from the old system of education.

Mbali Yes. I agree with Sizwe, there are too many changes but there is no follow-up to check if these changes are implemented or not.

Researcher What is your opinion, Zethu?

Zethu Yes. I agree with them. But I want to add that on top of that we are not given enough time to prepare for these changes. We are also not given enough time to implement them. They introduce a number of changes and they expect us to do, as they want us to do. But we are also not given enough training.

Buhle Yes. I do not think one day or even a week is enough for the training. These people give us little training but they have high expectations. They also do not consider that conditions in school differ greatly. For example, you cannot expect an advantaged school to cope with changes in the same manner as a disadvantaged school. Disadvantaged schools struggle because they do not have enough resources.

Researcher You say they and/or these people. Who do you refer to?

Buhle We are talking about the Department of Education.

Mbali Yes. The Department is unfair. They expect that what is applicable at an advantaged school can also be applicable at a disadvantaged school. But they forget that our enrolments are high and we do not have enough facilities. So it becomes difficult because the Department also does not give us enough support.

Researcher How does the principal support you to ensure that you not only understand but you also cope with these changes?

Zethu You mean support, like what?

Researcher I am referring to any kind of support. For example, support like training.

Zethu Well, if there is a change the Department organises workshops for principals. And then the principal would give us feedbacks from those workshops. But most of the times, principals come from these workshops not quite clear about certain things.

Sizwe The principal also gives us circulars from the Department informing us about changes. He also encourages us to attend workshops organised by the Department and/or the Non-Governmental Organisations.

Buhle Really, the principal tries to look for information for us. He goes out to look for information and he also encourages us to network with educators from other schools.

Mbali The other thing is that we have set aside a day for staff development. So what we do we conduct workshops on this day. And if there is anything that we are not sure about we look for outside help. We discuss things and

this makes things easier for us because if there is something that you do not understand you get a change for clarity.

Zethu But sometimes it ends up there. As we said that there are no follow-ups.

Sizwe But we cannot blame the principal because there are things that the principal also has problems with. For example, when we ask certain things in our meetings he would tell us that he is also not clear about them. As a result sometimes we find ourselves stuck.

Researcher Tell me, how are educational changes or policies communicated to you?

Buhle Well, the principal communicates these changes through meetings and by means of circulars. What happens is that if there is a change, the principal would call a meeting and we would discuss that change and its implications.

Mbali Yes. We discuss these things. But the problem is that most of the times the principal could not answer most of our concerns. And this is very frustrating because these changes concern our own future.

Zethu Yes. The principal communicates these changes to all staff members and sometimes even to the learners. He also invites parents to meetings in order to inform them of the changes. You must remember parents are an important component in education. But the problem is that parents do not come to these meetings and they end-up not knowing what is happening at school.

Sizwe Yes. Parents are a big problem. That is why schools have a disciplinary problem. When you call them to the meeting they do not come. In fact, most of the times parents that we are targeting do not come. Really, we do not have problems with learners whose parents attend meetings. These learners know that we can tell their parents if they misbehave.

Researcher Tell me, what do you regard as the main responsibilities/duties of a school principal?

Zethu I think the principal has to give direction. To direct everything that is taking place in the school. But the principal cannot do everything alone. So he has to delegate certain duties to the staff members. The principal has also to go out and get information for the staff.

Sizwe Yes. I agree with Zethu. The principal should look for information for us, particularly during the times like these when new things are being introduced now and again.

Buhle I think the principal should plan and control everything that takes place in the school. He is the first citizen of the institution, so he should know what is happening at every corner of the school.

Mbali Yes. I agree with them. I think the principal should not only give direction but he should also ensure that he supports us in whatever we are doing fort the benefit of the school.

Researcher So, what do you understand by the concept *managerial role*?

Buhle Hum! I'm really not sure what it means. But I think it refers to the role that the principal as a manager should play to ensure that everything in the school runs smoothly.

Sizwe I am also not sure of this concept. But I think Buhle is correct when she says it is about the role that the principal should play.

Mbali Well, I think it is about the principal being a manager managing the school. What do you think Zethu?

Zethu I think you are correct. The principal has a duty to manage the school.

Researcher In your opinion, what is the general purpose of evaluation?

Mbali I think the purpose of evaluation is to check if what you are doing is effective or not. And we use evaluation in order to keep parents informed about the performance of their children. Parents should always be kept informed about the progress of their children. So we use evaluation to communicate with the parents.

Sizwe I think we evaluate, for example to check if the polices are being properly followed.

Buhle I think you evaluate in order to check if you have achieved your objectives or not and to make improvement where necessary.

Researcher What do you understand by the concept *whole-school evaluation*?

Zethu I think whole-school evaluation is the concept that is used to check if the school as a whole is functioning properly.

Sizwe Whole-school evaluation is the term that is used for checking if everything in the school is in order. For example, it is to check if the school has all the policies in place and if these policies are being implemented. Whole-school evaluation is conducted to check if the school keeps its records and to check if educators are doing their work effectively. Basically, whole-school evaluation aims at checking if everything in the school is taking place as required.

Researcher Well, there can be policies but the question is, are the policies being implemented?

Sizwe Some of them are implemented and others are not because of the contradictions created by the Department. For example, there is still an outcry regarding the policy on discipline.

Researcher In your opinion, what is the difference between developmental appraisal system and whole-school evaluation?

Mbali I think they do link. For instance, the developmental appraisal system looks at the activities of an educator as an individual and whole-school evaluation looks at the school as a whole. So the developmental appraisal system looks at what an educator is doing at school and whole-school evaluation is looking at what is happening in the school as a whole.

Buhle I think these two are integrated by IQMS.

Researcher In your opinion, what is the role of the principal in whole-school evaluation?

Zethu I' m not quite sure. But I think the principal, as a manager of the school should ensure that everything is in place before whole-school evaluation is done. What I am trying to say here is that the principal should ensure that we as the staff and those that are associated with the school know what is expected of them during and after the whole-school evaluation. He should check if we do have all the necessary resources before whole-school evaluation is conducted.

Mbali And after the whole-school evaluation has been conducted, the principal should ensure that the recommendations of the supervisors are being attended to. If not, the principal should establish why the recommendations are not being implemented.

Sizwe But there is also a problem of funds. To minimise this problem principals should not only rely on school funds or the support of the Department but principals should also look for assistance from the Non-Governmental Organisations.

Researcher Let us look at the role of the principal before the external evaluation, what do you regard as his role?

Buhle I think the principal should make sure that we understand the concept *whole-school evaluation*. He should also ensure that we understand its implications. Basically, the principal needs to ensure that everyone is ready for whole-school evaluation. He should, thus, make sure that all information that we require or that he thinks we may require is made available to us.

Mbali For me, the principal should also get us the outside help before the whole-school evaluation is conducted. He should ensure not only that all staff members attend workshops for whole-school evaluation but also that they understand what is required of them.

Zethu But there were not many workshops organised for whole-school evaluation. Some of us attended only one workshop. But I must add that the workshop was not fruitful. So I do not think that there is much that the principal can do in that regard. I think the Department must make sure that they get right people to facilitate these workshops.

Sizwe Yes. I agree with Zethu. Workshops must also not be too short. They cannot expect us to understand these things within a short space of time.

Researcher Tell me, how was whole-school evaluation done in your school?

Sizwe The Department officials spent five days here. But what happened was that the team leader visited the school first and talked to the principal about their visit. After that we had a meeting where the principal explained to us what was to happen.

Buhle The external evaluators interviewed all stakeholders. They also observed some of us in classes. But not all of us were observed.

Zethu I would say the checked everything. They moved to each an every corner of the school. They even checked the drains, cleanliness, late coming, almost everything.

Researcher What challenges did you experience when doing whole-school evaluation?

Mbali I don't think there were challenges, except that most of us were not well prepared.

Zethu Really, we were not ready and after we were made aware that the supervisors were coming to our school we started organising ourselves. We tried to make sure that everything was in order.

Mbali That is why I said there were no challenges because as educators I think we know what is expected of us. Really, I can't say the fact that our work was not in order is a challenge.

Researcher If you say you were not prepared, what do you mean?

Mbali For instance, most of us do not do their daily preparations. Although we are expected to submit our work to our heads of departments, most of us do not submit. What I am trying to say is that our work is not checked on a regular basis. So after hearing that officials were coming to our school we started attending to the work that should have been done long ago.

Zethu But at times, it is not that we do not do our work or that we don't want to submit. The problem is that there is a lot of work that we are expected to do. And most of our classes are too big, so we also have a problem of marking.

Researcher Tell me, what role did you play in whole-school evaluation (both internal and external evaluations)?

Buhle Not all of us played a significant role. But supervisors interviewed some of us. Really, I don't remember any particular role that most of us played.

Researcher In your opinion, what is the role of parents in whole-school evaluation?

Sizwe I think the role of parents is always crucial not only in whole-school evaluation but also in everything that takes place at school. I am sure if we can work closely with the parents we can have less problem at school. I am talking here about disciplinary problems.

Zethu Well, I'm not sure what role should parents play in whole-school evaluation. I'm saying this because even the staff members did not play a significant role.

Mbali Yes. I agree with Zethu. But I also agree with Sizwe that parents should monitor their children and should also ensure that their children do their homework.

Researcher What problems did you experience when implementing whole-school evaluation?

Sizwe Well, I would say the major problem was that we did not have enough resources. In fact, we still do not have resources.

Mbali Yes. As a result we had to share the few resources that the school has. I remember everyone wanted to use these resources in order to impress the supervisors but some of us ended up not using them.

Buhle Please, do not remind me that. People were running up and down looking for something to use those days. I think overcrowded classes were another problem. What do you think Zethu?

Zethu Yes. Really, it is difficult to teach in an overcrowded class.

Researcher How did the principal support you to overcome those problems?

Buhle Really, there is not much that the principal can do when it comes to these things.

Mbali I agree with Buhle. The principal cannot solve the issue of resources because the Department tells parents not to pay the school fees.

Zethu I think the other problem is that our principals struggle to get assistance from the private sector. As a result it will take time for our schools to improve.

Researcher Tell me, what were the results of the evaluation?

Buhle One of the things that the officials mentioned was that we did not have all the policies. But I would say the external evaluators were impressed about our work. Generally, they praised us.

Zethu What I observed, personally, especially in grades eight and nine was that they did not get what they expected. What I am trying to say is that they discovered that most of us do not use the new system of teaching. I am talking about the outcomes-based approach. Yes. They did mention that we are still using the system of teaching. And they were really not impressed about that.

Sizwe Yes. I agree with Buhle that the supervisors were generally impressed with our work. In fact, they praised us in most of the nine areas that they focused on. But, guys, you know Department officials will always have something to criticize. But they were impressed about the quality of teaching in the school.

Mbali They were also impressed with the general conditions of the infrastructure in our school. But our school is not better off. All schools in this area are vandalised, particularly during school holidays. Most of the time when we come back from holidays we would find that something has been damaged or stolen.

Zethu But they complained about the manner in which parents and community members are involved in the school. Well, that was not a big issue because we also know that. Parents do not come to our meetings even if you invite a parent individually to address a specific problem with the parent won't come. In fact, they go to an extent of asking a friend or a neighbour to come on his/her behalf.

Researcher Tell me, what did you do with the results?

Sizwe Well, I n terms of policies I would say we formulated those policies that were not available when they came here.

Zethu Well, we had a meeting after them and we discussed their findings and recommendations. We then drew-up the school improvement plan. My understanding is that the improvement plan was then submitted to the District Office. But very little has happened thereafter. But even at school level not much has happened. I remember that we divided tasks among ourselves and we were to report back but that never happened.

Researcher What reason caused that?

Sizwe I think the problem is that most of these things need more time and we do not have enough time.

Buhle Really, I can't say why we are not addressing these things. But I think it is probably because people know that no one is monitoring these things from the Department side.

Mbali But I think the other reason is that the school does not have resources. As a result it is difficult for the school to address these things without the outside help.

Researcher How did the principal support you address the areas that need improvement?

Sizwe It is not east for the principal to support us. As we said our principals could not get help from the private sector. I am not sure why most companies are reluctant to help us.

Zethu Well, we drew-up the school improvement plan and the principal submitted it to the District Office. Our understanding was that after whole-school evaluation has been conducted the school should draw-up an improvement plan and submit it to the District Office. We were made to believe that the Department would do everything in terms of school improvements.

Buhle But the principal tries his best to get us help from outside. It is only that even the community does not have resources.

Researcher How does the Department of Education support you to address those areas?

Sizwe So far, nothing has happened. Yes. Whole-school evaluation was conducted and we never heard anything after that. But we were promised that after whole-school evaluation we would be getting help from the Department.

Buhle Really, we do not know what happened to the report with the findings and recommendations. I am not sure if the Department at Provincial level even knows what kind of help our school expects from them.

Mbali Yes. I agree with Buhle. Really, I am also not sure if the Department knows what kind of help our school expects from them.

Zethu Really, this is frustrating because we were made to believe that after whole-school evaluation has been done, the report was going to be submitted to the District Office. Our understanding is that we should work together with the District Office for the improvement of the school. But this is not the case.

Researcher Tell me, what was your attitude towards the whole-school evaluation?

Zethu Well, I would say it depended on the individuals. I am saying this because some of the people see the need of this type of evaluation. You can see that the purpose of it is to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the school. But then there are those individuals who see it otherwise. You must remember that whole-school evaluation involves a lot of work, so certain individuals developed a negative attitude towards it.

Mbali Really, when the supervisors came here I began to ask myself if there is really any need for us to wait for people from outside to do the work that we should be doing ourselves. Well, there are certain things that we cannot be able to do. But as an educator I know what is expected of me. So if I do not do that thing it is not because I do not know what I should do but it is because I do not want to do it. For me, their coming here was not a big issue because I know what I am expected to do as an educator. I think people who had a problem with the supervisors or external evaluators were those that do not do their work. So they found themselves in a big problem because they had to update their work. Those are the people that got frustrated by the presence of the external evaluators. I think we were supposed to look at whole-school evaluation as Zethu says, as an attempt to help the school to improve.

Researcher In your opinion, what is the purpose of the school improvement plan?

Sizwe Well, I think the purpose of the school improvement plan is to help the school in determining how it is going to get where it wants to be. Really, without a plan you cannot get your priorities right.

Buhle Yes. I agree with Sizwe. I regard a school improvement plan as a yardstick that the school should use to determine how it is going to achieve its objectives or goals.

Researcher So, what is the role of the principal in school improvement plan?

Zethu Well, the principal is the head of the school, so he should be involved in everything that takes place in the school. I think the principal should form a team that could draw-up the school improvement plan and he should also go out and look for information that the team might need in order to draw-up a proper school improvement plan.

Mbali The principal should also constantly communicate with the District Office in order to see how both the school and the District Office can work together to ensure that the recommendations that are in the plan are addressed.

Researcher Tell me, what have you learnt from the whole-school evaluation?

Zethu Really, I had high hopes about whole-school evaluation but I was shocked to see nothing happening after it was conducted. I think I have learnt a lesson that nothing happens if there is no one to monitor the project.

Sizwe Well, I did not learn much from the whole-school evaluation. In fact, most of the things that were required by the supervisors from us were the things that we know that we must do as educators.

Buhle I agree with Sizwe. But I think I must add that the visit by the supervisors reminded me that I must always do my work thoroughly everyday.

Researcher How would you describe the community that your school serves, it is advantaged or disadvantaged? Why?

Sizwe I regard this community as a disadvantaged community. I am saying this because parents cannot afford to pay the school fees. Basically, these parents are unable to support their children financially. I think I must add that most of these parents are unemployed.

Buhle Most people in this are unemployed, so the community is disadvantaged.

Researcher How would you describe a disadvantaged school?

Zethu I regard a disadvantaged school as a school that does not have the necessary facilities. For example, you find a school that is doing Physical Science but the school does not even have a laboratory, let alone the equipments.

Mbali You may find a school not even having enough desks. Really, such a school is disadvantaged.

Researcher How do you regard you school? Is it advantage or disadvantaged? Why?

Zethu It is disadvantaged. But I think it is better when you compare it with other schools, like those in rural areas. There are schools in the rural areas that have absolutely nothing. Learners still learn in appalling conditions. I think those are the schools that need help urgently. Please, get me well I am saying we do not need help, we do. But conditions here are not appalling.

Sizwe I think we are just disadvantaged like most other disadvantaged schools in this area. Look we do not have enough resources, so we cannot say we are better off than other disadvantaged schools.

Buhle No. I disagree with Sizwe. Much as we are disadvantaged but I think we are better than a number of schools even in the surrounding area. Tell me: how many schools have computers here? But here we have a number of computers. I am not suggesting that our school can be regarded as an advantaged school but I am saying comparatively speaking we are not that bad. Zethu is right. It is even worse when you think of the conditions of most of the schools in rural areas.

Researcher In your opinion, how do the educational changes taking place in the country impact on a disadvantaged school?

Zethu The problem is that these changes make a lot of demands on the school which most disadvantaged schools struggle to cope with. I n fact, I think most of these changes are favouring advantaged schools.

Buhle Yes. I agree with Zethu. In fact, most disadvantaged schools fail to cope with these changes. And I think these changes add a burden on the disadvantaged schools. It would have been better if these changes were introduced gradually.

Zethu My worry is that there is very little support coming from the Department. As a result these schools struggle to cope with these changes.

Mbali Yes. I support Zethu. The Department comes with a number of changes but it does not provide schools, particularly disadvantaged schools with things that can make it possible for them to implement these changes. So this really creates problems for disadvantaged schools.

Sizwe I think the idea is good. But I think they need to empower principals so that principals can ensure that disadvantaged schools are able to implement these changes. And principals should then report back to the Department and if they encounter some problems they have to call their supervisors to come to the schools to address such problems.

Researcher How do you think the managerial role of the disadvantaged school principal differs from the managerial role of an advantaged school principal?

Sizwe I think the principal of an advantaged school is in a better position because his/her school has most of the necessary resources. I think the role of this principal is to manage and maintain the resources that are available in the school.

Zethu I think the principal of an advantaged school is far better than that of the principal of a disadvantaged school. You must remember that advantaged schools have also support staff. I am referring to the administrative personnel. In some advantaged schools they even have Financial Officers. So these people support the principal and the principal only focuses on leadership and management roles.

Mbali Parents are also actively involved in most advantaged schools.

Researcher Before concluding, what other things would you like to share with me?

Zethu Well, I think we should have whole-school evaluation so that there can be effective teaching and learning in our schools. But I think there should be proper follow-ups.

Sizwe My concern is that the Department introduces a number of confusing changes. As a result we are not sure of our future as educators anymore.

Mbali My I say something about this issue? I want to say that provided the Department brings things that would be properly monitored things would be fine. And above all, the Department must provide genuine support to schools, particularly to the disadvantaged schools because those schools are struggling. What do you say, guys?

Buhle Yes. We agree with you. Really, the Department needs to put their house in order. They need to ensure all programmes that they introduce are monitored. And as Mbali says, they need to maximise the support that they offer disadvantaged schools.

Researcher Thank you very much for sharing this information with me.